

# THE MONTH

## A CATHOLIC MAGAZINE



NO. 582 (NEW SERIES 192) DEC., 1912

### CONTENTS

THE DIVORCE COMMISSION REPORT.....	<i>By the Rev. Sydney F. Smith</i>	561
OF CERTAIN DEFECTS IN ART-GALLERY CATALOGUES	<i>By Montgomery Carmichael</i>	576
GRACECHURCH PAPERS. XI. An Idyll and no King...	<i>By John Ayscough</i>	584
CHRISTIANITY IN THE FAR EAST. III. St. Francis Xavier in India.	<i>By the Rev. Herbert Thurston</i>	594
THE CHURCH AND THE HERETIC .....	<i>By the Editor</i>	607
THOSE OF HIS OWN HOUSEHOLD. (Translated from the French of René Bazin). (Concluded) .....	<i>By L. M. Leggatt</i>	621
MISCELLANEA .....		634
I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES.		
Phrases and Philosophies.		
Pictures "in Chinese."		
Does the Anglican Church permit Divorce?		
Simplified Spelling.		
II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH.		
REVIEWS .....		652
SHORT NOTICES.....		663
BOOKS RECEIVED .....		667

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO  
LONDON & ONE SHILLING

[Editorial Offices, 31 Farm Street, Berkeley Square, W.]

## STONYHURST PHILOSOPHICAL SERIES.

---

1. **Logic.** By RICHARD F. CLARKE, S.J., formerly Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Oxford. Second Edition. Price 5s.
  2. **First Principles of Knowledge.** By JOHN RICKABY, S.J., late Professor of Logic and General Metaphysics at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Fourth Edition. Price 5s.
  3. **Moral Philosophy (Ethics and Natural Law).** By JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J., M.A. Lond.; late Professor of Ethics at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Third Edition. Price 5s.
  4. **Natural Theology.** By BERNARD BOEDDER, S.J., Professor of Natural Theology at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Second Edition. Price 6s. 6d.
  5. **Psychology: Empirical and Rational.** By MICHAEL MAHER, S.J., D.Lit., M.A. Lond. Seventh Edition (Twenty-first to Twenty-fourth Thousand). Price 6s. 6d.
  6. **General Metaphysics.** By JOHN RICKABY, S.J. Second Edition. Price 5s.
  7. **Political Economy.** By CHARLES S. DEVAS, M.A. Oxon. Sometime Examiner in Political Economy at the Royal University of Ireland. Third Edition. Revised and Enlarged. (Tenth to Twelfth Thousand). Price 7s. 6d.
  8. **Theories of Knowledge (Absolutism, Pragmatism, Realism).** By LESLIE J. WALKER, S.J., M.A. Sometime Professor of Philosophy at Stonyhurst College. Price 9s.
- 

LONGMANS, GREEN, & Co., London, New York, Bombay, and Calcutta.







## *The Divorce Commission Report.*

---

THE Report of the Divorce Commission was published on November 12th, and by this time the nature of its recommendations is generally known. The Commissioners were Lord Gorell (President), the Archbishop of York, the Earl of Derby (who afterwards obtained leave to resign), the Lady Frances Balfour, the Right Hon. Thomas Burt, M.P., Lord Guthrie (of the Scottish College of Justice), Sir William Anson, Sir Lewis Dibdin (Dean of Arches), Sir George White (recently dead), Judge Tindal Atkinson, Mrs. Harold J. Tennant, Sir Rufus Isaacs (for whom on his becoming Solicitor-General was substituted Sir Frederick Treves), Mr. Edgar Brierley, a Stipendiary Magistrate, and Mr. J. A. Spender. By the terms of the Royal Warrant of November, 1909, as reinforced, after the demise of the Crown, by the Royal Warrant of May, 1910, they were to "inquire into the present state of the law and the administration thereof in divorce and matrimonial causes and application for separation orders, especially with regard to the poorer classes in relation thereto, and the subject of the publication of reports of such causes and applications; and to report whether and what amendments should be made in such law, or the administration thereof, or with regard to the publication of such reports." This they have been doing during the last three years, during which they have held seventy-one sittings and examined 246 witnesses. As was inevitable in an affair of such gravity there is a Minority as well as a Majority Report, the dissentients being the Archbishop of York, Sir William Anson, and Sir Lewis Dibdin.

1. The Majority Report recommends that to meet the needs of the poorer classes, for whom on the ground of expense application to the Divorce Court in London is impossible, the High Court should hold sittings and exercise jurisdiction locally in places where there is now a Registry of the High Court, and, if necessary, some others also, the hear-

ing of cases being entrusted to Commissioners selected from among the County Court Judges or others equivalently qualified. To this class of the Majority's recommendations we can give at all events an hypothetical assent. Granted the justice of the position they take up, namely, that divorce is a blessing making for social peace and morality which should therefore be as open to the poor as the rich, it follows at once that local courts should be provided, with judges of sufficient insight and experience to preside over them; and the recommendations made, in which the Minority coincide substantially with the Majority, appear to meet the circumstances sufficiently well. Where, as faithful adherents to our Lord's commands, we are opposed is in holding divorce to be not a blessing but a curse, which, if right were done, should be denied to rich and poor alike, but which, if these further facilities for procuring it are allowed, will be only the more free to extend its devastating influence over the land.

2. The Majority recommends that the two sexes be equalized in every respect. At present a husband can divorce his wife on the sole ground of her adultery, but a wife cannot divorce her husband unless she can bring home to him the double offence of adultery and cruelty. How, say the Commissioners (for here again the Minority are in agreement with the Majority), can this distinction be justified? "In principle there can be no adequate reason why two persons who enter into matrimonial relationship should have a different standard of morality applied to them," and they note that in Scotland, and most of the other countries where divorce is permitted, the equality of the two sexes is already recognized by the law. Thus in Scotland this law of equality has been "in full operation," just as it is now, ever since 1560, according to the testimony of Lord Salvesen. Here again is a point in favour of which, could the principle of divorce be admitted, much may be said. At the same time, inasmuch as adultery on the part of the husband is vastly more frequent than on the part of the wife, and is likely always to be so, the effect of this equalizing of standards must be enormously to increase the number of existing marriages which are open to dissolution, should the aggrieved parties care to use their right of petitioning. It is true that adultery on the part of the husband will usually be much harder to trace, and true likewise that wives, where no form of cruelty, physical or mental, accompanies the adultery, will usually be

more forgiving than husbands, realizing that, though considered as a sin the offence is not less grave but in some respects graver in the husband than in the wife, in its social effects it is much less injurious in him than in her. Still, even when this set-off has been discounted, it is difficult not to feel that, in recommending this equalization of the sexes in the matter of divorce, the Commissioners have widened very considerably the entrance to the Court for those who seek its questionable aid.

3. Before considering whether, besides adultery, other causes for divorce should be allowed, the Commissioners discuss the question of judicial separations, that is, separations *a mensa et toro* without dissolution *a vinculo*. Orders for these, under the present law, are obtained from the Courts of Summary Jurisdiction which, if they give them at all, must make them perpetual. The Majority Report, here again with the assent of the Minority, recommends that orders for permanent separation shall be reserved to the High Court, but that Courts of Summary Jurisdiction be allowed to issue orders for temporary separation, for periods not exceeding two years, this being required for cases of urgency and cases in which the hope of future reconciliation is possible. Some amendment is also proposed as to the grounds on which these orders for temporary separation may be made. It is proposed that they shall in future be four in number. Cruelty, habitual drunkenness, desertion, and neglect to maintain—which involves some simplification of the conditions under which desertion can now be charged, and the incorporation of habitual drunkenness in the list. With this portion of the proposals we can cordially agree, but the Majority Report, whilst reserving to the High Court the power to order permanent separations, expresses in emphatic terms its dislike for the whole principle of this kind of separation. It recommends their retention, "because these orders afford a remedy for Roman Catholics and persons disapproving of divorce," and for this concession to our needs we have to thank its signatories. But it would far rather see them disallowed altogether and divorce sentences substituted. Judicial separations, it says, "place the parties in a position in which, whilst they remain married, they are subjected to enforced celibacy. Such separation has been frequently and strongly condemned" (namely, by the Edwardine *Reformatio Legum*, by Bishop Cozens, by Mr. Bishop in *Marriage*,

*Divorce and Separation*, and certain modern legal authorities whom the Report can cite), "as inadequate to meet the situation, and as productive of immorality and misery to the parties, both the innocent and the guilty, and detrimental to the interests of the children." From this view we must emphatically dissent. What is meant is that persons thus separated are constrained very frequently to form social relations—as for instance, does a judicially separated man with the woman he engages to look after his children—which leading on naturally to sexual intercourse become immoral, whereas if instead of judicial separations they had obtained divorces, they could have been free to remarry, and so purge their new sexual relations from the guilt of immorality. It is assumed that all reasonable people would take this view of the ethical effect of remarriage after divorce. But not to speak of Catholics, who would consider these attempted second marriages to aggravate not diminish the guilt of the adultery, why is it not observed that good-living persons generally, even from among those who think that the State should legalize for civil purposes marriages entered on by divorced persons, instinctively discriminate between these unions and those of truly married persons, and regard them as not free from a moral taint? And this tendency to discriminate will abate only in proportion as the general moral tone of society deteriorates; so deeply is it rooted in the minds of men that the State has no real power to make moral what is in itself essentially immoral.

4. What is most disastrous of all in the conclusions of the Majority Report, constituting as it does the most deep-reaching assault on the unity of marriage, is its recommendation that adultery should cease to be accounted the sole ground on which divorce may be granted. They tell us that ten other grounds have been suggested to them as needing to be added, Bigamy, Wilful Desertion, Cruelty, Incurable Insanity, Habitual Drunkenness, Long-continued Imprisonment, Disease, Unconquerable Aversion, Mutual Consent, Refusal to perform Conjugal Duties. The reasons *pro* and *con* for each of these they consider, in regard to some at great length, in regard to others most superficially. Eventually they conclude by recommending these six grounds, Adultery, Wilful Desertion for three years and upwards, Cruelty, Incurable Insanity after five years confinement, Habitual Drunkenness, found incurable after three years from first order, Imprison-

ment under commuted death sentence. One may wonder why, if they are prepared to go so far, they are not prepared to go further, but they consider that whilst Bigamy, (contagious) Disease, and Refusal to perform Conjugal Duties can be brought under the headings of Adultery and Desertion, it is distinctive of the six grounds they accept that they "are generally recognized as in fact putting an end to married life," which is not the case with the others. Moreover they urge that imprisonment for crime, apart from a life-sentence, can prove a means of reforming the prisoner, and so even exercise a beneficial influence on his matrimonial relations. And as for Unconquerable Aversion, more commonly known as Incompatibility of Temperament, it is, they say, indistinguishable from Mutual Consent, whilst the inclusion of Mutual Consent among the reasons for divorce is "not likely to meet with substantial support at the present day in England"—though they are constrained to admit that "some persons consider this as the only solution of the difficulties of married life under the conditions of modern civilization." We cannot but rejoice that the Majority Report has rejected, for whatever reasons, this ground of mutual consent, opposed as it is formally to the principle of the unity of marriage. But we could wish that it had realized better the extent to which the grounds it does include in its list offer facilities for the accomplishment of their purpose to those whose real ground for seeking divorce is "unconquerable aversion." It persuades itself that collusion is not frequent and is not a danger to be much feared, but that is not the common experience of those familiar with the working of the Divorce Courts. "I think," said Mr. Barnard, K.C., "if you have divorce for desertion, it is practically coming to divorce by consent," meaning that it is impossible in most cases to trace the collusion which has usually been at work. Lord Desart, indeed, who was King's Proctor for many years, testified that the cases of collusion they were able to bring home were not more than two or three a year, though they inquired into many. This is taken by the Majority Report to prove that collusion is not very frequent. But it should rather be taken to imply that collusion is very seldom detected, whilst it is the general impression that it is frequent. And still more is this the case with regard to another of the proposed new grounds, namely, Cruelty, as experience has shown in the United States.

5. Besides new grounds for divorce the Majority Report recommends the recognition of new grounds for obtaining decrees of Nullity, in other words, it would institute what the Church would call new Diriment Impediments. These are four in number, where the other party is of unsound mind at the time of marriage, or in a state of incipient mental unsoundness then which declares itself and becomes known to the other party within six months after marriage; where the other party at the time of marriage was subject to epilepsy, or recurrent insanity, with the same proviso as in the case of insanity; where the other party is suffering from venereal disease at the time of marriage and conceals it from the first party, with the same proviso; where the woman is found at the time of her marriage to be in child by some other man, and she has concealed the fact, with the same proviso. On provisions so crudely conceived there is of course much to say, independently of the question whence the State derives its power to enact them.

6. One must also reckon as among the grounds of divorce, as being practically such, the right given to an applicant whose former partner has been absent for a term of years, and is presumed to be dead, to contract another marriage, which shall be valid even should the lost partner turn up again alive.

These are the substantial changes which the Majority Report would introduce into the present Marriage Law. In recounting them we have intermingled some brief criticisms of the various points, but it remains to add some criticisms of a more fundamental character. And here at the outset one cannot but be struck by the *personnel* of the Commission, for the selection of which the Government of the time when they were appointed is responsible. It does not seem excessive to say of it that three were chosen to represent the Christianity of the country, and seven to represent its non-Christianity, it being thus predetermined that a Majority Report in a non-Christian sense should bear seven signatures, and a Minority Report in a Christian sense should bear three signatures. It may be said that this must always happen, but one would like to have seen a better grasp shown of the whole subject by the Majority Report, which passes over unconsidered many serious matters which the Minority Report shows to have been brought under the notice of the Commission. But to come to some details.



1. And in the first place as to the basis on which the Majority Report rests its conclusions. The Commission of 1857 took the precept of our Lord, as recorded in the Gospels, for its basis, though it adopted the well-known misinterpretation of the excepting clause in Matt. xix., which, if it is to bear a sense in harmony with its own context, and the text of the parallel passages, must be understood of separation *a mensa et toro*. The present Commission rejects altogether this basis, on the double ground (1) that the law must be accommodated to the needs of the population as a whole, a large section of which is non-Christian, and (2) that Christian divines differ as to the meaning of Christ's words, the Roman Catholics taking them one way, the Protestants in another, and modern Protestants going so far as to maintain that they are consistent with the principle of divorce on other grounds than that of adultery. One might have thought, as to this last point, that there could be no difference of opinion among persons who profess to go by the Gospel. But, it must be conceded to the Commissioners that they had heard Canon (now Dean) Hensley Henson, who thought that Christ's words were "not legislative"; Dean Inge, who thought that "our Lord's prohibition of divorce is absolute in form rather than intention," and that the State may "assume the power of dispensation" in a "few cases besides adultery;" Canon Sanday, who thought that these words "express a moral ideal rather than a positive rule;" and the Rev. C. W. Emmet, who thought that "we are meant to go to the Bible for principles not for detailed legislation." In view of this diversity of opinion among the Protestant theologians, and the undoubted fact that England is no longer a country whose inhabitants are predominantly Christian, it could not perhaps be expected that the Majority would take the Gospel as their basis, and that is the feeling expressed even by the Minority in their Report. Still, whilst we recognize that more could not be expected of the recent Commission, we cannot but regret deeply, in the general interests of clean living, that it should have recommended the abandonment of the sole principle which can secure the ideal they professed to have before them, that of the sanctity of the marriage bond and of its unity for normal cases. For there can be no true unity whilst there is the possibility of other unions, and no sanctity in unions which, being destitute of divine sanction, sink to the level of purely human contracts.

2. Having to find a basis independent of religion for their matrimonial ethics, they can find it only in "unfettered consideration of what is best for the interests of the State, society and morality, and for that of parties to suits and their families." This, as a merely theoretical statement, may sound well; yet one cannot but reflect that, being substituted formally for the Gospel precept, it carries by implication the meaning that the seven Commissioners are better qualified than our Lord Jesus Christ to judge in a matter of infinite complexity and delicacy, "what is best for the interests of the State, society and morality." This, indeed, will seem not unbecoming to the non-Christian portion of the community, who are quite prepared to set aside our Lord's judgment on such social questions as of no consequence, but what should impress even non-Christians is that the private judgment of these few persons cannot form a standard of any certainty or fixity. The Minority, in its Report, is likely to be condemned for its "ecclesiasticism" by those who desire further facilities for divorce, but it manifests a much deeper insight into the realities of life than does the Majority Report, and on this point of certainty and fixity it says well:

We have now dealt with the five new grounds for divorce which our colleagues recommend should be established. There is one distinctive mark of them all. They are purely empirical in the sense that they are tentative, experimental, dependent upon qualification and degree. Desertion for three years is chosen, but we are told that if the well-to-do only were concerned, four years would have been recommended . . . Insanity is to be a cause, not only under conditions of time, but also of the age of the parties. Imprisonment . . . for say, twenty years is to be a cause, but not penal servitude for ten or fifteen years. Cruelty is to be a cause . . . and is defined in a set of words which may mean anything from gross personal violence to the continuous exercise of a sharp tongue or the habitual indulgence of a surly temper. Inebriety is to be a cause, but the proposed definition of it leaves much to the discretion of the Court.

And then again, what promise of finality for the moral standard they lay down can those give who take for their basis social expediency as estimated by themselves? We have argued that—though Mutual Consent, if the advice of the Majority Report is taken, is not to be a formally recognized ground of divorce—the effect of collusion in its manipulation of the pleas of desertion and cruelty may easily be to



snatch divorces, which to all intents and purposes are given on this sole ground. But what is to prevent this ground from becoming before long legally recognized? The Majority Report, as we have seen, can only give as its motive for excluding it now, that its inclusion would be "not likely to meet with substantial support at the present day." If this means that the majority of Englishmen would at present be hostile to its inclusion, it is probably true, but when the ball has been set rolling downhill as the Majority Report proposes that it should be, we have to consider what the mass, or at least the main influence, among Englishmen of a decade or two hence is likely to be. Even as it is, an active and influential party is pressing for this further step, and is claiming that sheer consistency demands it, now that the old fiction of a divine law is discarded, and divorce is acknowledged to be the fitting relief for partners who find that the bonds of their present marriage are a great hardship. Thus Sir John Macdonell, Mr. A. C. Plowden, the stipendiary magistrate, Mr. Maurice Hewlett, the novelist, and Miss Llewelyn Davies, the General Secretary of the Women's Co-operative Guild, all in their evidence before the Commission expressed this view, some of them very decidedly. Yet these are quite the sort of persons who may succeed in making their opinions effectual now that the Commission has given them such a leverage. And Mr. Newton Crane, an American witness, testified that in the United States, since the people have become familiarized with divorce, "the view is spreading that, if an unhappily married couple desire to have their marriage dissolved, it is a matter which is peculiarly their own affair and one with which the public has nothing to do." If that is the effect of multiplying divorces across the Atlantic, may it not be similarly the effect here of the multiplication of divorces under the proposed new system, and, if so, will it not lend itself to the wretched apostleship of persons like those just mentioned?

3. One cannot but notice how the Majority Report passes over subjects the careful consideration of which was vital for the exercise of a sound judgment on the questions laid before them. In this respect it is most instructive to compare the two Reports. Thus the Majority Report enumerates the grounds for divorce in the different colonies and foreign countries, but, save for the case of the United States, has no figures to tell us of the extent to which divorce prevails in those parts, or

the influence it exercises on their social life. As to the United States, it acknowledges grudgingly, in a single sentence, that, according to the evidence of Sir John Macdonell, "the highest divorce rate and the greatest increase among civilized countries, Japan excepted, are in the United States, the statistics available appearing to show that the number of dissolutions was, at the time of the collection of the statistics, in the proportion of about one to twelve or fifteen marriages." But then it proceeds to dispute the significance of these statistics on grounds which, in the face of such high figures, most people will regard as petty. Very different is the procedure of the Minority Report, which devotes a well-documented section to the "Lessons of Experience." From this we learn that in France, the growth of divorce, since the passing of the Divorce Law of 1884, has been such that "between 1886 and 1906 the number of divorce decrees has increased from 2,950 to 10,573 per annum;" and that M. Mesnil, an expert witness called by the Commission, testified that the gravity of these facts "had begun to cause anxiety to the French Government." In the United States the Minority, quoting Government statistics, tell us that "whereas in 1867 there were 9,937 divorces, in 1900 there were 55,751," a number which "by 1906 had risen to 72,062"—statistics which we may supplement from Professor Walter George Smith's article on Divorce in the *Catholic Encyclopædia*, with the fact that, according to the Government Census from 1867 to 1887, the total number of divorces was 328,716, and from 1887 to 1906, 945,625. Nor does the growth of population explain so large an increase, for according to Professor W. G. Smith, between 1870 and 1880, the increase of population was 30 per cent., that of divorces was 79 per cent., between 1880 and 1890 the increase of population was 25 per cent., that of divorces 70 per cent., between 1890 and 1900 the increase of population was 21 per cent., that of divorces was 66 per cent., and between 1900 and 1906 the increase of population was 10.5 per cent., that of divorces 29.3 per cent. Statistics like these fully bear out the statement of the U.S.A. Census Report, cited by the Minority Report, that "the rate of increase in divorce is far greater than the rate of increase in population." It is indeed increasing "like the velocity of a falling body." What then? It may well be that the scandalous facilities for fraud which spring almost inevitably from the fact that each State of the Union

has its separate divorce law, or the fact that numbers of the immigrants were married in their own previous countries, account in some measure for the high figures of American divorce statistics; but even then the residue must be so enormous that it ought surely to give pause to those who, in the face of a similar, though smaller, steady increase, are asking in this semi-official way for an increase of facilities here at home. And this the more so because there is a patent fallacy in these reasons suggested for minimizing the gravity of the American figures.. However much we may allow for the number of State jurisdictions, or the number of immigrants, it remains that that enormous and increasing number of people, tempted by the bait of the divorce laws, were pressing to obtain release from their matrimonial bonds. After all that is the essential fact which the statistics teach us of the social consequences of a divorce law and its extensions.

4. An entry one might have expected to find in the Index to the Report is "Family life, effects of divorce on." But one looks in vain; nor does the heading "Children," which has several entries on the custody of children, furnish anything to show that the Majority paid much thought to the effects of divorce in breaking up the home, to the detriment of the parties' own moral and social well-being, and still more of that of their children. The Minority, on the other hand, have an excellent section on this subject in which they direct attention to the importance of the family for the well-being of English social life, and the necessity of strengthening rather than weakening the attachment to it—in face of the serious dangers to which the conditions of modern life, with its growing individualism, are exposing it. The Majority, on the other hand, just in one place allude to this subject, namely, when rebutting the suggestion that divorce has this evil effect in North America. "It does not seem established," they say, "that the unsettling of family life, which is alleged to exist in some parts of the United States among certain classes of society, is due to any substantial extent, if at all, to the operation of the divorce laws; facilities of travel, increase of luxury, a growing spirit of independence, a resentment of restraint, must all be taken into account." But could anything be more futile? Certainly these other things must be taken into account, both as the direct cause of much of the unsettling of family life, and as the direct cause of so many divorces. What, however, the Majority should have

noted is that the divorces, when brought about in this manner, cause a still further unsettling, or rather a complete break up, of family life. Does this need proving? Is it not in the nature of things? According to the American statistics, "about fifty per cent. of the divorced couples have children."<sup>1</sup> When these fathers and the mothers go apart, on which side are the children to be, and how are they to get the blessings of a complete home? The Majority will say they are only seeking to substitute a lesser evil for a greater, and that the home is already destroyed by the parental discords, and besides is as effectually destroyed by judicial separations as by divorces. No, not so effectually, because less absolutely and with less disgrace. Besides, the point we are chiefly labouring here is that these increased facilities of divorce, by the encouragement they give to parents to persist in their dissensions instead of striving to heal them, tend to destroy homes, with their nurseries, which otherwise might have remained intact. As the Minority say well:

The provision of exceptions to the life-long tie of marriage must tend to weaken the very things the State desires to strengthen. Will people be more careful about marrying when there is a suspicion of drinking habits, or lunacy, if it is known that when drunkenness or lunacy develops, divorce with permission to re-marry may be easily obtained? Again, will people be more willing to make mutual sacrifices and allowances if they know that a careful absence of moderate duration may set them free?

5. The Majority conclude their Report by a reference to the Marriage Laws. It is very brief, because they consider it to lie outside their scope. But their point is that it might help to check the increase of divorces, if better measures were taken to prevent improvident, reckless, and unsuitable marriages. They suggest (1) that marriages should not be permitted at too early an age; (2) that more stringent provision should be made to prevent the marriage of minors without the consent of parents or guardians; (3) that more publicity should be ensured for the notice of an intended marriage and the performance of the marriage ceremony; (4) that there should be insistence on the mental and physical fitness of those desiring to marry, as well as on the adequacy of their means of subsistence. With the third of these points we cordially agree, but as to the other

<sup>1</sup> *Cath. Encycl. ibid.*

three there are difficulties to which the Majority have apparently not adverted. Nor would they, taken all together, offer more than a very feeble resistance to the flood these Commissioners would let in upon us. Might they not, however, have kept well within their scope, and yet have looked about for more effectual preventives in another direction? In the most inadequate historical survey with which they commence their inquiry they come across the Catholic Church in the medieval period. In those days, as is well-known, divorce *a vinculo* was absolutely unknown. How then, did the people get on, if it be true, as the Majority seem to think, that a country cannot do without some system of divorce for the alleviation of hard cases? The suggestion made is that they had what was equivalently a system of divorce, but was professedly a system of decrees of nullity administered with cynical disregard for the truth of facts. This, we may note incidentally, is an appalling misconception as to which they would have done well to invite Mgr. Moyes's comments. But what we wish to ask now is, Why did the Commissioners confine their study of the Catholic system to a period so far back in its past. Did they make no study of its nature and working at the present day? They had indeed, two Catholic witnesses to examine, and they do seem to have taken some evidence on the subject from Father Michael Kelly of Hoxton, which, as far as it went, told against their contention. But the Majority Report shows no trace of having considered this point. It just mentions Ireland, with the mysterious but significant remark that "apparently the conditions of life differ materially from those in this country." And it has nothing about the Catholic population in France and Italy, in America, &c. Had the Commission taken evidence as to the state of these Catholic communities, it might have found that, though they are under a law of absolute indissolubility, which is certainly not now-a-days tempered by any such irregularities in the administration of their marriage law as it pleases Sir Lewis Dibdin to think were rampant in the middle ages, they are everywhere quite contented with their condition, and even congratulate themselves on their immunity from the disease they see to be working such havoc outside. True, they have occasionally, though far less frequently than their neighbours, their matrimonial disagreements which sometimes require judicial separations. But the knowledge that for them divorce has no existence, prompts

them to close up rather than to tear further apart any breaches of amity that may arise between man and wife, and so get through life without that aggravated domestic discontent and seething revolt, and at the same time without that extensive breaking loose into the condition of concubinage, which, if the principles of the Majority were sound, would characterize Catholic communities before all others.

In view of this object-lesson set before the world by the Catholics—in common, we cordially grant, with the section of Protestants who share our detestation of divorce—is it not manifest that the Majority have gone the wrong way to work? Should they not have reflected that you do not cure an evil passion by indulging it? Should they not, instead of seeking to satisfy the classes that clamour for divorce by offering them further facilities, have looked to the sources of their revolt against the marriage contract and sought to apply the remedy there? Had they consulted the Catholics as to the best remedy, they would have been referred, in the first place, to the sacraments, to the sacramental character of marriage and to the other sacraments which sustain and protect it. This counsel, they could not, as Protestants, have accepted, though by rejecting it they lose what is of prime importance. But, at least, they might have heeded the warning of the Minority, where it tells them that “the only real remedy . . . will be found not so much in Acts of Parliament as in such influences as can be exerted to rouse the conscience and stimulate the moral sense of the nation.” And at least they might have appended to their final paragraph a reminder that, if unity of marriage is to be preserved, at all events as the national ideal and the normal condition, it is necessary that a resolute movement should be undertaken by those who have power and influence, for the eradication of all this miserable cult of pride and insubmissiveness, this spreading contempt for wholesome conventions, this glorification of self-indulgence of all kinds, this excessive luxury in the rich and excessive pleasure-seeking among rich and poor alike, this passion for sexual self-realization, as it is called, together with the rank crop of lascivious books, plays, dances, by which it is so unfailingly overfed, all this “new ethics” in short which is poisoning the veins of the nation’s moral life; and, on the other hand, for the restoration to its rightful throne of the cult of duty, of obedience, of humility, of self-control and self-denial, of moderation, forbearance and consideration for



others, in short of that good old ethics of our fathers, which alone can preserve to the nation a healthy social life. Perhaps it would have been too much to expect them to go a step further, and recognize, as it needs to be recognized, that there is an intimate connection of cause and effect between this false ethics from which the nation is suffering, and the advocacy of atheism, theoretical and practical, which agencies like the Rationalistic Press Association are sedulously disseminating, as there is likewise at the opposite extreme between the predominance of the true ethics and the teaching of religious truth in the religious atmosphere of truly Christian schools.

These are some, though by no means all, of the criticisms to which the Majority Report of the Divorce Commission lies open. We must remember, however, that it is but the report of a Commission, and of seven out of the ten members who compose it. Will their ideas ever be embodied in Statute Law? Not infrequently, as we know, to refer a question to a Royal Commission is a mode of bearing it to its grave. In the present instance the Divorce Law Reform Union—as we are assured by its Secretary,<sup>1</sup> is engaged already in preparing a vigorous campaign which is not to end till it has succeeded in “placing a thorough and adequate measure of Reform [does it mean this which the Majority recommend or something more extreme still?] on the Statute Book within a minimum of time.” We must expect such people to act according to their kind. But can we hope that the publication of the Report, including as it does the fine criticism of the Majority by the Minority, will arouse the main body of the English people to the danger which threatens them?

S. F. S.

<sup>1</sup> *Morning Post*, Nov. 13th.

## *Of Certain Defects in Art-Gallery Catalogues.*

---

THE ideal catalogue were a subject needing a small volume to treat of adequately. It is an ungrateful subject, moreover, for the material for such a catalogue is largely wanting. How seldom is it that we are told the reason why such and such saints are in the altar-piece. The consequence is that most of the altar-pieces in a gallery are only made half alive to the student. I do not say it would be easy to supply what is wanting; on the contrary, I say it would be difficult and costly. But knowledge of the kind is not wholly irrecoverable. By deep delving in notarial archives and family records, by minute researches in local history, both diocesan and civil, by the study of local miracles and shrines, of individual monasteries and churches, of confraternities and charitable foundations, much might be done to bring essential elementary information such as this to light. The galleries, I fear, will wait till individual students—each his own Mæcenas—do the costly work. It is almost hopeless to expect Governments to find the funds to carry out that local research which is still necessary to complete the description of most of the altar-pieces in art-galleries.

\* \* \* \* \*

In this brief paper I only propose to touch on a few defects in the descriptive portions of catalogues, which can be remedied with little trouble and at small cost. To begin with, the bewildering terms "right" and "left" should forthwith be abolished from all catalogues. The Berlin catalogue (1906), bluntly and without qualification, lays down the law dogmatically that the terms "right" and "left" used in the description of a picture, *always* mean the right and left of the person looking at it. The old Modena catalogue (1854), in a more enlightened spirit, takes up a point of view from inside the picture: "left" is the beholder's "right," and "right" his "left." The Hermitage (1909), the Brera (1908), the Louvre (s.d.), and the Munich (1908) catalogues, lay down no rule at all, so that in his closet, with



only the catalogue in his hand, the student is quite unable to determine the meaning of those simple terms "right" and "left." The National Gallery (1906) and the Dresden (1908) catalogues both adopt the same rule, which in the words of the former runs: "In the description of pictures the terms *right* and *left* are used with reference to the right and left of the spectator,<sup>1</sup> *unless the context obviously implies the contrary.*" The compilers of these two catalogues, by the saving clause, have at least left themselves a greater latitude of description and greater facilities for arriving at precision, as for instance, "on the right of the Virgin," or "on the left of the Throne." But even thus, doubt and confusion arise at times, and will continue to arise, as long as *right* and *left* are used by people who are practically looking into so many mirrors reflecting life face to face with themselves. To take an instance or two from the National Gallery catalogue: No. 1295, Girolamo Giovenone, *Madonna and Child between St. Francis and St. Bonaventure*, "on the right of the Throne stands St. Francis": the context here surely suggests that St. Francis is standing on the right-hand side of the Throne or beholder's left, whereas he is on the left of the Throne, or beholder's right. Again in No. 1144, Sodoma, it is said that "St. Catherine stands on the right of the Virgin": this can only mean on the Virgin's right hand, but the Saint is standing on the Virgin's left. Of No. 249, Lorenzo di San Severino, *The Mystic Marriage of St. Catherine*, the compiler writes, "before the Throne are kneeling, on the left St. Demetrius of Spoleto, and on the right St. Catherine of Siena."<sup>2</sup> Who shall say here beyond all

<sup>1</sup> "Spectator" is an uncomfortable word in this connection, and "beholder" is but little better. No word in the English language seems quite to fit the action of a man looking at pictures in an art-gallery.

<sup>2</sup> There are two *Blessed* Demetrius' of Spoleto, both Franciscans, and both Hermits of Monteluco (Jacobilli, i. 418, and ii. 329). But the venerable and beautiful figure in this altar-piece is a Dominican, the Blessed Costanzio of Fabriano, who died at Ascoli on the 25th February, 1481. His presence in this picture, with the rays of a *Blessed*, shows that it was painted after that date. Soon after death, the Blessed Costanzio was chosen as another patron of Fabriano. I suspect that a little local research would bring out a very interesting story in connection with this picture. It is also interesting as evidence—if any were wanted—that canonization by the voice of the people never went any farther in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries than beatification. No properly instructed or controlled painter would ever give the full halo of saint before the Church had pronounced. Fra Angelico never gives more than the rays of a *Blessed* to St. Catherine of Siena. The Blessed Costanzio was not formally beatified till the reign of Pius VII.

doubt, in the face of terms so confusing in their simplicity, that the context obviously shows that the right and left of the Throne are intended, as happens to be the case?

Where altar-pieces are concerned this confusion is easily avoided by using the expressive terms Gospel side (*cornu Evangelii*) and Epistle side (*cornu Epistolæ*). These terms, too, serve to remind the student of the use to which these pictures were once put, and to direct his attention to the *provenienza*. To make the beholder's right and left the rule clashes with the feelings which should govern the student, whatever his beliefs, when contemplating pictures born of a religious sentiment. To speak of a hallowed space on the right hand of the Blessed Virgin as "the left" has a sinister sound about it. The place of honour in an altar-piece is on the Gospel side, *e.g.*, San Sisto in the Sixtine Madonna, he being the titular Saint. The real point of view of a picture is from the inside. Otherwise the "spectator's left" may be held to be a thing of greater consequence than the Right Hand of Almighty God Himself.

The terms Gospel and Epistle side only help us in describing altar-pieces. But there is a very simple and efficacious means of replacing the confusing terms *right* and *left* in the case of all other pictures, and that is by adopting the heraldic terms *dexter* and *sinister*. *On the dexter* is the beholder's left, *on the sinister* his right. These terms put him in his proper place—inside the picture—just as the proper point of view of a shield is from the saddle of a knight's charger. Here we have a fixed, clear convenient rule, void of all possibility of confusion, and as applicable to a *genre* picture as to a fresco. We have reason to be thankful to the noble and exact science of heraldry for helping us in so great a difficulty.

\* \* \* \* \*

*Santa Conversazione* is a vile and misleading phrase which should speedily pass into the limbo of all sickly sentimentalities.<sup>1</sup> Even if it means a coming together of saints rather than a holy talk among saints, it entirely obscures the reason

<sup>1</sup> I have been unable to trace its origin, nor have the learned in such matters to whom I have appealed been able to help me. No single instance of its use in this sense is given in the Vocabolario of the Crusca, in Tommaseo, or in any other Italian dictionary. The expression, therefore, is without real warrant. In classical Tuscan *Santa Conversazione* is one of two things: (1), a holy life: (2) more rarely, a Religious Order or Community in which the saintly life flourishes.

why these saints are in the picture. In fact, the picture is not in the least what it is called,—a *Santa Conversazione*. The saints have not come here to meet together or to talk. Every saint in it stands by himself, and he stands for the founder's devotion. In the *trecento* altar-pieces each saint has his own niche in the general framework, or if two saints should happen to be enclosed within the same space, each will at least have a dividing arch above him. In the *quattrocento* fashion changed; the saints have come out of their niches, and, without visible division, figure in the same broad surface of the *tavola*. But the motive for treating them as unrelated entities has not changed; and the truly religious painter still keeps them separate in spirit. All Francia's altar-pieces, and all Borgognone's, are good examples of groups of saints in one *tavola*, undivided but unrelated. Later painters, with a sentiment as false as their taste was bad, have attempted to give a spurious impression of some sort of united action in pictures of this kind. The serene recollected figures of the late *quattro*-and early *cinquecento* developed into talking and gesticulating human beings at their hands, and the reason of their presence above the altars became pictorially obscured. It is this mistaken idea that there is unity of action in an altar-piece that leads to the use of expressions in catalogues like "the Virgin attended by St. John Baptist and St. Nicholas of Bari." The Virgin is attended by angels: the saints are there for the same reason that she is,—to satisfy the devotion of some pious founder. Of course I am referring only to altar-pieces containing the Blessed Virgin and a few saints. In a Nativity, an Assumption, a Coronation, life and movement and united action are naturally to be looked for; nor is it unnatural that altar-pieces containing witnesses to the Immaculate Conception should seem to be united in proclaiming the same dogma.<sup>1</sup>

\* \* \* \* \*

"Donor" is a term which has got itself so firmly established in all writings about religious pictures that it seems almost as much an affectation to protest against it, as to at-

<sup>1</sup> It is odd that German catalogues usually describe such pictures as a *Disput* or *Streit*, "*über die unbefleckte Empfängniss*." There is no *Streit* at all, but a very perfect agreement, as witness the texts of the same tenour which the saints so often bear on their scrolls in these pictures (*i.e.*, N° i. 317 in the Kaiser-Friederich *Vorrat*).

tempt to substitute the correct "Royal Banner" for the meaningless "Royal Standard" which has taken its place. But the incorrect Royal Standard has done no particular mischief, whereas the meaningless "Donor" has done much to fix attention on the picture only, and keep men's minds off the altar which, if interrogated, could have told them so much about the picture. In what sense is one of those kneeling figures on the Epistle or Gospel side of an altar-piece a "Donor"? To whom has he given a picture? The picture, though the modern price of it would often build a handsome church, is only a small part of the "gift." The donor is the founder of a benefice. He has put down the funds for the endowment, for the structural edifice of a chapel, for the frescoes with which its walls are painted, for the stained-glass window which illuminates it, for the vestments, for the altar, the altar furniture, the altar-frame and the altar-piece, and he has almost certainly added a family mausoleum to the family chapel. What he has done has been *sibi suisque*; he is a founder, and no "Donor." He has, in a sense, given, but to Almighty God, not to a church, or even the Church. The foundation is private property, whether it be in a church or a palace, or a separate building on a country estate; it belongs to the founder and his heirs, and, if in a church, has not been given to the *Opera*. He should be called a founder therefore, and it is misleading, and even absurd, to dub him "Donor."<sup>1</sup>

If a man have a small picture of our Lady painted in her honour for use in his private oratory, or maybe his chamber, and it contains his portrait in the attitude of prayer, he is still called, but is still less, a donor. This work is even more peculiarly his own than the picture in his private chapel. If some friend have the picture with the portrait painted for him as a gift, so far from being the donor, he is the receiver. "Donor" is assuredly a word which should be banned. In these small pictures "client," or "devout client," of Mary, or the patron Saint, is perhaps the only fitting description of the devotee,—client, not in the sense of customer, of course, but of dependant upon a patron. The distinction is worth bearing in mind and using: "client" shows that only

<sup>1</sup> If a benefactor were to give an altar-piece to an Altar of the *Opera* in want of it, he would of course be a donor. But such cases can only be very rare. Painters received their commissions for altar-pieces from *Operari*, Religious Orders, Confraternities, or private founders.

a small picture is in question, and "founder" that it is question of an altar-piece.

\* \* \* \*

It is the commonest thing in catalogues for the attributes of saints to be erroneously called "Emblems" or "Symbols." More than that indeed: whole books devoted entirely to attributes are called "Emblems of the Saints," or "Saints and their Symbols." There is no excuse for such misnomers, and no point in propagating them. An Emblem is an object which, *taken by itself*, represents a quality, a virtue, something abstract, as the scales are the Emblem of Justice. So is a Symbol, but superior to an Emblem, it can sometimes, *taken by itself*, represent a being, as a Lamb by itself is the Symbol of our Lord, a Dove by itself the Symbol of the Holy Ghost, a Lily among Thorns the Virgin Conceived Immaculate. But an Attribute merely serves to identify a being, and must go along with that being. A gridiron by itself is no Symbol or Emblem. When found with a young saint in a dalmatic, it becomes the Attribute of St. Laurence.

A Symbol, at times, may partake of the character of an Attribute, but only in identifying particular classes, not particular individuals. Thus a palm is the Symbol of a Martyr, the Halo of a Saint, the Pallium of an Archbishop, the Crozier of a Bishop or Abbot. St. Peter's Keys are both Attribute, Symbol and Emblem,—the Attribute by which we distinguish him from other Apostles, the Symbol of his Authority as Vicar of Christ, and the Emblem of his Power of binding and loosing. Learned writers on these high matters are not all agreed in their views, but one thing at least is indisputable, and let us thankfully seize upon it,—that the objects by which we identify individual saints are not Symbols or Emblems, but Attributes.

\* \* \* \*

But it is in the matter of the style and dress of Religious Orders that catalogues sin most heavily. There is a uniform and recognized way of speaking of these matters, and it is greatly to be desired that the compilers of catalogues should make themselves masters of the subject, and purge their work from its many flaws and errors. It is the commonest thing, for instance, to find friars described as monks. It may be possible, by profitless hair-splitting, to maintain that a friar

is a monk,<sup>1</sup> but as the distinction exists, and is perfectly clear and extremely serviceable, it is advisable that it should always be carefully drawn. Franciscans, Dominicans, Augustinian Hermits, Carmelites, Servites, all are friars. Such a phrase as "St. Thomas Aquinas clad in a monk's robes" is particularly unfortunate: St. Thomas was a Dominican friar: and a monk's robes implies that there was only one kind of monastic habit. Such untechnical expressions as "monks' robes," "robes of his Order," &c., smack of the historical novel and are entirely anathema! "Habit" is the proper term: "the habit of his Order," "the Franciscan habit," &c. But where monastic saints are represented in their cowls (as they nearly always are), it is better to say "cowl": e.g., "St. Romuald in a white cowl." Cowl should be used of the monastic choir dress only (a loose garment with wide sleeves and a hood); it is erroneous to speak of a "Dominican with his cowl over his head," or "a cowled Carmelite." "Hood" is here the proper word: no Order of friars wears a cowl.<sup>2</sup> In the case of hermits *not belonging to an Order*, "dress" is the better word: "a venerable figure clad in a hermit's dress"; but "St. Nicholas of Tolentino in the habit of an Augustinian hermit friar." Another common error—though there is no instance of it in the National Gallery catalogue—is to call the crown of hair left on the head of a cleric or religious his "tonsure." This is really the corona: the tonsure itself is the part tonsured. Such an expression as "an iron-grey tonsure" is absurd and meaningless, but lesser folk have sinned in this respect in the company of great genius (e.g., "The monk, as I judged from the break in his tonsure, a few scattered white hairs upon his temples being all that remained of it," &c. Sterne, *Sentimental Journey*). Another common error is to call a monastery a convent, and a convent a monastery. As a general rule, friars inhabit convents, and monks monasteries. Benedictine and Carthusian Nuns, and the religious women of Mendicant Second Orders, inhabit

<sup>1</sup> But a monk is very certainly not a friar. Who that has sojourned in a living Charterhouse can read without a shudder such a phrase as "Carthusian Friars in white Robes" (N. G. Cat. p. 81). Besides, friars were still unborn in St. Bruno's day.

<sup>2</sup> If the original form of the habit of the Austin Friars ever was a cowl in the monastic sense of the term (a debatable point), it soon developed into a manifest tunic with capuce, and from the days of the Alexandrine union (1256), was always belted. The wide sleeves of the friars *ad instar cucullarum*, worn on ceremonial occasions, are detachable and slip on over the sleeves of the tunic.



nunneries, a far more explicit and expressive word than convent. A monastery, convent or nunnery should never, even in the biographical part of a catalogue, be described as a "prison-house" (N.G. Cat. p. 315): the expression is untechnical and savours of old-time prejudice. Besides, in substance it is untrue, the real truth being that monasteries, convents and nunneries were founded to free captive men and women from the "prison-house" of the world.

\* \* \* \* \*

Such, set down in all too disjointed fashion, are some of the erroneous and pointless expressions used in the descriptive portions of art-gallery catalogues. At the same time, it would be difficult to praise sufficiently the great learning and patient research that characterizes the chief catalogues of Europe. We English have particular reason to be proud of our National Gallery catalogue. If educated people would only confine themselves to twenty great pictures in one morning and read *every word* the catalogue says about each, biography and all, they would be astonished to find the progress they made in the knowledge of the history of painting. The deficiencies of the catalogue, the want so often felt of the original *provenienza*, of the Dedication of the Altar, of the reasons why the Saints are in the altar-piece, are not the fault of the compilers. Let us hope that the time is not distant when they will be given the funds to make those local researches which may help to bring to light and confirm, attributions which are the chief concern of some, and the full history and meaning of pictures which are still the favoured study of too few.

MONTGOMERY CARMICHAEL.

NOTE.—One word more. I.H.S. written thus as the initials of three words, is one of the most singular and persistent errors in England, and the National Gallery catalogue is not immune from it. What really is intended is IHS, the monogram of the Holy Name, which in its Gothic form, at all events, came from the mediæval spelling jhesus. IHS means no more than JESUS. *Jesus Hominum Salvator, In Hoc Signo*, &c., are late, forced and fanciful readings due entirely to those mischievous fullstops. True Britons have even rendered the letters Jesus Holy Saviour!

## *Gracechurch Papers.*

### XI. AN IDYLL AND NO KING.

IN a former paper we spoke of Miss Camilla Galt as having had a romance; and it left its traces on her. There was nothing melancholy about her, but there seemed to cling to her a vague fragrance, as of one who had suffered, and had not been soured by pain, but made sweeter by it. She must always have been of a sweet and gentle nature, nevertheless there must have been in her also a certain rigidity of principle not so rare, perhaps, in tender, yielding-seeming women as is sometimes supposed. For the breaking of her engagement had been an affair of conscience, and must have been horribly painful to her: no doubt it caused pain to others also, but that she believed, rightly or wrongly, could no more be helped than the suffering to herself.

When her brother Lancelot was a big lad at school he fell dangerously ill, and Camilla, their mother being already dead, went off to nurse him.

For a long time the boy lay in such danger that his sister was quite isolated in the sick-room, seeing no one but the doctor, and the professional nurse who shared her labour: one week Camilla taking the night duty, the next changing it with the nurse. But as Lancelot grew better his friends were one by one admitted to sit and talk with him, and among them was his greatest friend of all, one of the masters of the school. The Rev. Lucas Hurstbourne was obviously a man with a future before him: at the University he had distinguished himself, and had not given over distinguishing himself since. He was already known as a writer, though perhaps very learned critics did not make much of what he had written. The majority of readers, however, are not specially learned, and Mr. Hurstbourne's books were popular, and kept his name before the public. He was also a fluent preacher, and many people admired his sermons almost as much as they admired him—for he was good-looking, and had a fine presence in the pulpit and out of it.



Lancelot Galt thought him a genius, and instructed his sister to that effect: and she found that her brother's high opinion of his friend was shared by many others, not only among the boys but among the masters as well. Mr. Hurstbourne knew that he was popular, and did not object to it, but he was clever enough not to seem conceited: and accepted a good deal of incense without making too much of it. Lancelot declared that he was only too humble, considering what excellent right he had to think well of himself; and Camilla was content to take her brother's view of it.

Anyway, Mr. Hurstbourne was really kind to the lad, and encouraged him not to be depressed by the loss of time his long illness had occasioned at rather a critical moment.

"I will coach you, and we must only make up for lost time," said the master. And he kept his word, so that in a few months Lancelot passed on to the University with a scholarship that argued very well for his future.

"Silverian scholars generally do something afterwards," Mr. Hurstbourne assured Camilla: and Lancelot modestly protested that he would never have gained the scholarship without his friend's help.

"It is very nice of him to say so," Mr. Hurstbourne told Miss Galt, when her brother had left them alone, "but the truth is Lancelot is indebted chiefly to himself. He is brilliant: and I am not the only one that knows it."

This was at Whitehall, where Mr. Hurstbourne and his late pupil were staying for Christmas. Everybody there was civil to the young clergyman, but he found himself most at ease with Camilla. Mr. Galt did not care for clergymen in general, and it somewhat annoyed him to hear his son attribute these initial successes to his friend's help: it behoved his son to be successful on his own account. As for Miss Jasmine, the schoolmaster was a bit afraid of her. As to sport he knew nothing and cared less, and much as he despised it, he had a misgiving that Lancelot's younger sister laughed at him in secret because he knew very little about dogs, and had only a general classical acquaintance with horses—and chariots.

Even Lancelot's sincere flattery was embarrassing because it was too open: Mr. Hurstbourne could put up with a good deal in that way when administered in judicious privacy.

When clouds of incense were wafted in his direction before Jasmine, Mr. Hurstbourne (with the sensitiveness of

genius) suspected a sort of sniff in the young lady, as though the odour were disconcerting to her taste. Mr. Galt objected to incense on principle, and had besides an uneasy sense that his son and heir was making too much of a mere tutor. Mr. Hurstbourne had no money, and Mr. Galt had a good deal: he did not see any use in putting his guest too high. Nevertheless he did not refuse his consent when Camilla came and told him that she had engaged herself to Mr. Hurstbourne, subject to his approval. As the schoolmaster had no money he could not expect to receive much dowry with his bride.

And Mr. Galt had an idea that he and Jasmine would get on very well without his elder daughter. He certainly was not afraid of her: but she was a little too superior, and he suspected her, not indeed of Puseyism, but of lacking that vehement horror of Puseyites which was his own stock-in-trade in the matter of religion.

Mr. Hurstbourne, to do him justice, had not been thinking of money when he proposed to Camilla: he may have thought of it before he fell in love, but he really had fallen in love, and was not particularly sorry when Mr. Galt informed him that his daughter was not an heiress. It would not have suited the young man's ideas that he should have been said to marry for money, even by people who knew nothing about it. As it was, the income she brought him was hardly more than what he would lose by giving up his fellowship. Of that fellowship, and the loss of it which his marriage would entail he did contrive, in some tactfully indirect fashion, to remind Mr. Galt.

The marriage was not to take place immediately: engagements were apt to be longer in those far off days when nobody was in quite such hurry as everyone is now. Mr. Hurstbourne and Camilla were to be married just before the Christmas following, nearly twelve months distant.

During part of the long vacation he was again at Whitehall, as, of course, was Lancelot: and Camilla was very happy with her brother and her betrothed. Mr. Hurstbourne could have been happy even without Lancelot, and Lancelot himself was half tempted to think the engagement that had so greatly delighted him had partly spoiled his friend. There certainly seemed to be occasions when his friend manœuvred a little to get out of his way: and, when he failed, he was hardly so impassioned as he used to be in speaking of *Æschylus* and

Sophocles. Perhaps the prosperous lover's mind was not in perfect tune with supreme tragedy.

Those were the golden days of Camilla's life: and, to her death, the memory of them brought to her odours of summer woods and fields, the breath of laughing zephyrs, and murmur of myriads of winged and living creatures unseen among the high branches of great trees. The old sweet world smiled indulgently upon her youth and hope. But Camilla's hope reached further than present life and youth: of marriage as a sacrament she had not been taught, but it was in fact as a sacrament that she regarded it, with implicit, untaught faith. The whisper of breeze and tree must mean to her God's benediction or it would be meaningless: the smile of summer was nothing to her except as translating the unseen smile of the Lord of earth and sun. Unless He were Himself the Priest of her marriage, she could not dare to be so happy. As it was she sometimes feared. A gift too high for her, she thought, was being given.

Her lover had no such misgiving. To him it was a natural gift, common to most men and women in all ages, and he did not mind gifts being, if they were, beyond his deserving. If being a good husband would make him deserving of Camilla, he was determined to deserve her. If his happiness was not commonplace, it was not wistful, timorous, doubtful of its credentials. I think Lancelot was partly right in finding his friend less interesting as a prosperous lover than he had been before.

Summer ended, and the long vacation ended when autumn was already begun. Lancelot and his friend went away together: only for about two months. Then they were to return, and a fortnight later Camilla was to be taken away a happy wife.

*Dis aliter visum.* They came back: and at the end of the fortnight Mr. Hurstbourne went away but Camilla did not go too.

What happened Gracechurch never knew: it was said that only one person, except the two people most concerned, ever was told: and even she was only told in part.

On the night before her wedding-day—as it should have been—Camilla and her betrothed were sitting together in the fire-lit silence of a room where they were alone, thinking. Presently he asked her why she had so little to say.

"Because I have so much to think of," she answered, smiling.

"Happy thoughts?"

He smiled too, feeling sure they must, like his own, be happy.

"Yes, I wonder if I am *too* happy. I cannot see that I deserve so much."

"Ah! Nemesis! But we are Christian folk and poor Nemesis was a heathen."

He did not seem afraid of her. But Camilla had as little as he to fear from any heathen goddess. Camilla was not thinking of heathen fates or gods.

"Yes," she said. "We are Christians: if you knew me, as I know myself, would you think me good enough for the wife of a Christian priest?"

He was not addicted to thinking of himself as a priest: the Christian priests whom he chiefly thought of as such have no wives.

"I am sure," he declared with a mild accession of pomp, "that you are fit to be the wife of any Christian minister."

"But I am not sure," she whispered.

Her ideas of a Christian minister had nothing to do with Sophocles or Æschylus, or even with popular, non-committal sermons that those great men might have listened to with no emotion deeper than a mild conviction of the decadence of philosophy and emotion since their time.

Mr. Hurstbourne was not irritated: he was too prosperously contented. He was not even eloquent—eloquence is mostly angry, wretched, or discontented. He merely said:

"Tut, tut."

Camilla scarcely heard.

"I will tell you," she said, in a quiet voice, bending forward and watching a face in the fire. It was changing rapidly, as fire-faces do. At first it had seemed to her like his, and comely as his was: but it grew formless and was gone, before she finished what she wanted to say.

She told him of her faults: of a placid, decorous vanity and self-complacency: of a faith vague at times and faltering: of one awful time in which faith had seemed dead altogether: of a secret love for this present world and its pleasures, and hopes, and trumpery greatnesses that she knew were littlenesses all the while: of selfishness, and self-satisfaction, and of a staid, unscandalous indulgence of self: of pleasure in praise: of liking to be called "good" and charitable: of a thousand spots and blemishes on the mirror

of her soul that should only have reflected God, looking in it for the likeness of Himself that He had made.

When she ended the face in the fire was quite gone and her lover's face was smiling—indulgently. He was almost touched: it was pretty, but it was not practical.

"And *you*," he cried gallantly, "are not good enough to be my wife? Let *me* tell *you*."

It did not strike him that he had missed her point: it did not strike her yet. The point had not precisely been whether she were good enough for *him*. She had indeed meant him—thinking of him as of what his calling made him seem to her.

"Let me tell you," he said.

And he told her: some sort of confession like hers. What it was he told she never repeated to anyone. It is not likely that it was anything which the world, or he, would think very bad. He was a perfectly respectable young man, and he was not at all imprudent: he merely failed to conceive her point of view: otherwise he would not have told her.

For seventeen years at least Gracechurch, in its moments of frequent leisure, exhausted itself in conjecture unbridled by charity or probability. But Gracechurch knew no more about it than I do. All that ever was known was that Camilla Galt found in what he told her something that made him other than the man to whom, on the morrow, she had been ready to vow before God not obedience and love only, but honour. That vow she would not take. It was the eleventh hour, but in the one hour remaining she must and would save herself.

All that Gracechurch knew was that the morrow came, and with it deep snow, but no wedding. The churchyard paths were swept clear for bridal feet, for the weddings of those days took place early, and the men were alert betimes and the gates of the churchyard were all far from the church doors: but no bridal party paced them: no wedding-bells had to struggle with the snow-filled air: on the Sunday following, Camilla, who should have been in Italy by then, was in her usual place in the Whitehall pew, and only the God to whom she prayed knew why she was still there. Many condemned her, knowing nothing: He who knows all things must have pitied her.

The gifted, though discarded, lover relieved himself by a thin volume of verses, commended by the critics more

than his former published works, for the excellence of their form and style: some recommended him to stick to poetry and eschew theology, or slightly unhealthy romance: but this advice he did not follow. Numbers were only easy to him in the first sting of injury and reprisal: and by the time he was engaged again the Muse of Poetry had, with a queer smile, deserted him. The actual Mrs. Hurstbourne had some occasion to complain that the sonnets to Amelia lacked the genuine spirit of the bitter, if sincere, elegiacs on false Camilla. But Mrs. Hurstbourne was better off than the false Camilla, and did not see any particular necessity for her husband's wasting their money in producing lean books of verse at his own expense: and poetry seldom pays its way, as we may conclude from the beautiful story of the publisher who assured the late Mr. Browning that "if Shakespeare, nay if the Prince Consort, were to approach him with verses, in the then state of the trade, he would have to say the same firm 'No.'"

Camilla wrote no verses, and never called her Lucas cruel, for she never mentioned his name, and, gentle as she was, no one ever dared mention it to her. For seventeen years she remained Camilla Galt, to the great contentment of many poor and, I daresay, worthless persons. As she could not be happy herself, in the way she had thought of, she simply set herself to making the miserable less miserable so far as her means and her lights showed her. Her father and her sister did not molest her, with advice, or question, or fussy sympathy. Her brother never quite forgave her, and she never sought his forgiveness at the price of explanation or self-justification. She had lost her lover, let him keep his friend.

The slow years went by: and many springs and summers came to warn her that love and life went on heedless of one particular shadow on the flowered fields, and one chilled hope in a world that can live by nothing less.

If her lover had had right to complain of her, she, at least, had the greatness to complain of no one: she made no wry faces, and had nothing hard to say of life: a shadow had fallen her way, and she could think of nothing better than trying to lift it a little where it fell harshly on others.

At the end of those patient years she did marry, and, by a twist of fate, or by a gentle guiding of heaven towards humility, she chose another schoolmaster. There was nothing brilliant about Mr. Hartley: his future, as old Miss

Dray, with pungent bull, remarked, was all behind him. He was a smallish, dark man, "without a presence"—as even Miss Broom reluctantly admitted: and he was on the practical side of forty. He had no fellowship, and he was not rich without one. He was not given to raptures about Æschylus or Sophocles, his enthusiasm was all for trigonometry and the higher mathematics. He was a quiet, rather silent man of good character and capacity but without any following of prophetic admirers. As he was not a clergyman he could not preach showy and ornate if somewhat shallow sermons, as Mr. Hurstbourne had done, and his only publication was a short treatise on Conic Sections that did not lend itself to quotation.

It was December when he and Camilla became engaged and early in January they were married. I remember the wedding very well. It did not altogether satisfy Gracechurch, which did not see why Miss Galt, though seven-and-thirty now, should dispense with bridesmaids and have only four mature "attendants" instead. These ladies were all dressed differently, in handsome warm gowns "more indicative" thought Miss Broom "of the austerity of our climate than suggestive of the auspiciousness of the occasion." And they wore bonnets which merely matched their dresses and had nothing precisely bridal about them. But what occasioned most criticism was that the bride herself was not clad in white but in pale lavender silk—"for all the world," said Miss Broom, "as if it had been a second marriage."

The morning was raw and frosty, and "roses rather than lilies"—I apologize for quoting Miss Broom so often—"decked the noses of the attendants." But Camilla looked serenely happy, and, if her girlish beauty was gone, she was still a fair and sweet bride. There were many poor folk to watch and bid God bless her: they knew well they were losing a patient and steadfast friend.

Gracechurch missed her: and all who spoke of her did so with respect. She had been too shy and reserved for downright popularity, but all were conscious of something high and noble about her. To no one had she ever failed in courtesy, of no one had she ever spoken with sharp wit, or crude and easy criticism. Of herself she had never spoken at all.

About a year after her marriage the elder Miss Dray,



then an old woman, was one day reading the paper when she came upon a paragraph that made her cry out and nearly let the gold-rimmed spectacles drop from her high-bridged nose.

"Good gracious! Harry, what do you think?" she exclaimed. "Mr. Hurstbourne has been made Head Master of Downchurch School. That's where Mr. Hartley is Mathematical Master. I do think that's hard on Mrs. Hartley."

It was hard on her: he was the only man on earth whom she would dislike to meet: and, though Downchurch School is big and famous, Downchurch is a little place where all the masters and their families must be continually thrown into a sort of necessary, official intimacy. Her marriage had been happy, though not brilliant, and she had been content with her simple, unimportant lot. It was not pleasant for her to know that her husband must now be under the man whom she had so nearly married: and that she and that man must now be continually meeting.

Everyone at Downchurch knew that she was "cruel Camilla": but everyone at Downchurch presently bore witness that she bore herself well in the trying circumstances that had befallen her. They were inclined to suspect that the new Head Master had more cause than she to wish he had never published the Camilla poems.

Mrs. Hurstbourne tried to snub her, but she might as well have tried to snub the dome of St. Paul's: she then tried to patronize her, and might as easily have patronized the Matterhorn: finally she became afraid of her, a fact of which Camilla never betrayed the smallest consciousness.

By the time Mr. Hartley was made Professor of Mathematics in the new Midland University people at Downchurch had come to think that he and his wife were entirely indifferent to the presence of Archdeacon and Mrs. Hurstbourne at Downchurch School. But, for all her dignity, Camilla was anything but indifferent.

"Well, all's well that ends well," said Miss Broom, when she heard of Mr. Hartley's promotion. "But it's a pity she married a man with the same initial letter to his name as her first choice. It was sure to bring vexation. 'Change the name and not the letter is change for worse and not for better.' Everyone knows that."

"It was convenient, anyway," said old Miss Dray, "her



first trousseau would do for the second wedding without picking out the marking."

"You forget there was seventeen years between: I doubt it was all worn out."

"My memory," observed Miss Dray with asperity, "is as good as ever it was. So is my hearing."

Miss Broom had for many years been a little deaf but would not own to it.

JOHN AYSCOUGH.

## *Christianity in the Far East.*

### III. ST. FRANCIS XAVIER IN INDIA.

IT is not in any way the purpose of this short series of articles to provide a continuous history of missionary effort in Asia. My principal, if not my sole, object has been to direct attention to the new light which recent investigation has been able to throw upon certain definite points of interest. I pass, then, without apology, from the China of the seventh century to the India of nearly a thousand years later. After the lectures of Father Dahlmann on the Apostle St. Thomas and the exposition given by the *Variétés Sinologiques* of the Si-ngan-fou inscription, it will not, I trust, be out of place to turn to the laborious research which has of late years been devoted, on many hands, to the career of St. Francis Xavier, and which has culminated in the splendid biography of the Saint by Father Alexandre Brou, published only a few months back.<sup>1</sup>

It is not that Father Brou is able to add very much positive information to the abundant details already familiar regarding the life of the Apostle of the Indies. The principal source of our knowledge about the Saint must always be his own letters. Thanks to the labours of Father L. M. Cros<sup>2</sup> and the magnificent undertaking of the Madrid Jesuits, the *Monumenta Historica Societatis Jesu*,<sup>3</sup> we possess the letters now in texts critically edited and, so far as possible, cleared of the glosses and paraphrases of the early translators. But the amount of new material from his own pen is relatively small and unimportant. Neither has there been any remarkable addition to the outside documents bearing on the

<sup>1</sup> *Saint François Xavier 1506—1552*. Paris: Beauchesne. 2 vols. 1912.

<sup>2</sup> *St. François de Xavier: Sa Vie et ses Lettres*. Toulouse. 2 vols. 1900.

<sup>3</sup> The portion more directly affecting the present subject is the series of issues entitled *Monumenta Xaveriana*. The first volume, of more than 1,050 pages, was completed in 1900; the second is still in progress.

subject which was not already accessible to the Jesuit historians in the seventeenth century. The Life by Father Valignano and the minutes of the local inquiries made in the process of canonization, have now been printed in the *Monumenta*, but a good deal of this information had in fact been used by the earlier biographers. What Father Brou has done, and done supremely well, is to supply the requisite setting. He has, of course, diligently assimilated, sifted and condensed the material accumulated by previous inquirers, ancient and modern; but this has been almost the least part of the task which he has set himself. The great merit of his work is its perspective. Father Brou has thoroughly studied the historical background, and he has thrown a clear light upon the relation of the methods of St. Francis to the social and moral condition of those amongst whom he laboured. Neither has he ignored the questions which the critical mentality of the modern reader is wont to raise in connection with all such biographical records. There is nothing contentious or controversial in the tone of the book, but the very natural inquiries which rise unbidden to the mind have been anticipated and, on the whole, satisfactorily met.

Perhaps I cannot give a better illustration of the fresh points of view which Father Br  u so frequently introduces than by calling attention to the use he makes of the writings of the Protestant preacher Bald  us.<sup>1</sup> The more spiteful type of anti-Catholic controversialist, having very little else which he can lay hold of to disparage Xavier's missionary labours, is apt to denounce the facility with which he administered baptism, and to declare that in consequence of the lack of any adequate instruction before reception, the work of conversion was ephemeral. This is an objection to which Father Brou replies in his last chapter. He shows, in the first place, how unfairly such a charge is pressed if we regard the work of St. Francis as a whole. China, as all the world knows, he never reached. In Japan, to which more than two of the best years of his short missionary career were given, the Christian Church which he had founded flourished exceedingly until the time when, some sixty or seventy years afterwards, a war

<sup>1</sup> It is not suggested that Bald  us has never been cited before in this connection. For example, Marshall, in his *Christian Missions*, and Father Van Nieuwenhoff, in his *Dutch Life of Xavier*, both appeal to Bald  us, but Father Brou has shown great skill in making effective use of such materials without being overlaiden by them.

of extermination was directed against the converts with a persistence and a barbarity almost unparalleled in history. No priest was allowed to land, those who were already there were banished or put to death, no foreigners of any degree were allowed to penetrate into the country, but all were compelled under rigorous conditions to limit their intercourse to a few trading ports. The attempts made by certain heroic missionaries to break through these regulations only resulted in hopeless disaster. Within a brief time of their landing they fell into the hands of their persecutors, and no choice was left but death or apostasy. But even so, when, after two hundred years, Japan was made accessible to the foreigner again, it was found that, though deprived alike of priests and sacraments, some villages had retained the traditions and practices of the Western faith. The story of Catholic Christianity in the Moluccas, as Father Brou points out, was very similar to this. Here the converts were first pillaged in the raids of the Mohammedans, and then ground to powder by the occupation of the Dutch. Once again Catholic priests were shut out for good and all. Small wonder that in these islands the Christian communities, scattered and lacking cohesion, dwindled away without power of recovery. Whatever was wanting to complete the ruin of Xavier's work was supplied by volcanic eruptions, that broke up whole settlements, and by a commercial policy on the part of the Dutch, which resulted in systematic depopulation. Practically the only instance in which the labours of St. Francis have been subjected to tests which can in any way be regarded as normal, is that of the Paravas of the southern extremity of India, the pearl fishers around Cape Cormorin. Most assuredly the Christianity which he planted there has not been exempt from trial. For scores of years this region became the battle ground between Dutch and Portuguese. The priests were repeatedly driven from their flocks, but they were able to hide in the interior and hold some intercourse with their people. And here it is that the evidence of the minister Baldæus,<sup>1</sup> a

<sup>1</sup> It is curious that in the *Encyclopædia of Missions* (Protestant) published by Funk and Wagnall, no mention is made of Baldæus. The earliest Protestant missions to India are there assigned to the 18th century. As for the action of the Dutch in Southern India the same work says:

"With the conquest of the Dutch the palmy days of Roman Catholicism ended [in Ceylon]. The priests were banished, Roman Catholic rites forbidden on pain of death, and the people were commanded to become Protestants. No unbaptized person was allowed to hold office or to own land, while Roman

Calvinist preacher who acted as military chaplain to the Dutch oppressors, is so exceptionally valuable. He came to these parts more than a century after Xavier had passed on to lay down his life in regions still more remote, but he appreciated the conditions of such work, he saw its results, and he was generous enough not to withhold his tribute of admiration, grudging in some sense though the tribute be.

After praising and quoting largely from the farewell instructions delivered by Xavier to the missionaries before he set sail for Japan, Baldæus, in the folio volume which he published in Dutch concerning Malabar and Ceylon (anno 1672), proceeds as follows—I quote from a curious old eighteenth century English translation:

A most excellent speech, worthy to be imprinted in the hearts of all faithful ministers of Christ, and the more valuable upon that score that his deeds were altogether agreeable to his words. For embarking at Goa for Malacca, he thence set sail in a Chinese junk for Japan, where he arrived happily at Cangoxima, where this great man did not think it below himself to be instructed in the first rudiments of the language for Christ's sake.<sup>1</sup>

And here Baldæus explains how St. Francis had the articles of the faith, &c., translated into Japanese, while continuously studying the language himself, and he goes on:

In this he ceased not to labour day and night, being moved by an uncontrollable zeal of planting the gospel among these pagans. Truly a very commendable zeal, and not to be forgotten by all who bear the name of Christians; and though Xaverius his religion differs in certain points from ours, yet might his piety and other commendable virtues serve as an encouragement to all pious ministers to follow his footsteps in performing the service of God to the utmost of their power. It must be confessed, on all hands, that had not the active spirit of the Jesuits awakened the Franciscans and other religious orders from their drowsiness, the Roman Church had, before this time, been buried in its ruins, and as for myself, I am very willing to own that my pen is not capable of expressing the worth of so great a man, though, at the same time, I am of opinion that if Xaverius

Catholics were placed under greater disabilities than Buddhists or Hindoos. Soon converts to the Protestant Church were numbered by the hundred thousand." But the article goes on to point out that these conversions were so worthless that they were disavowed by the Dutch Protestants themselves.

<sup>1</sup> Printed in Churchill, *Collection of Voyages* (1704), vol. iii. p. 607.

were alive now, he would disown many things, especially as to his miracles, since published by his followers.<sup>1</sup>

What is perhaps an even more conclusive tribute of respect, on the principle that imitation is the sincerest flattery, is the simple fact that Baldæus in his own small missionary efforts, distinctly tried to carry out the method followed by St. Francis. He tells us plainly that he did so, and gives us even specimens of his translations into Tamul, which evidently copied the general features of Xavier's compendium of the Christian doctrine. Speaking, for the moment, of Ceylon, he says:

It was Franciscus Xavierius who converted the inhabitants here, as well as those of Cape Comorin and the Paravas. The said Xavierius established certain teachers among them called Canacappels,<sup>2</sup> who were to instruct the inhabitants, and especially the young in the first rudiments of the Christian religion, as the Ten Commandments, the Creed, the Our Father, &c., which they did with indefatigable care and industry. When this was done, there stepped in the Jesuits (called Paulites here because they were sent into the Indies by Pope Paul III.) who, in their way of teaching both old and young, did far excell the Franciscans, and all other Orders among the Romanists: and I am very free to confess that I have frequently followed their footsteps in reforming the churches and schools in Manaar and Jafnapatnam, as far as they were consistent with our religion and consonant to the genius of these nations. It being absolutely necessary that he who undertakes this task should be acquainted with the method to be used among these people in the infancy of their conversion; intricate questions and mysteries being more apt to confound than to instruct them. For which reason it is most proper to teach them the naked truth of the gospel in as few points as possibly can be done (the youth being very apt to retain here what they have been told), to catechise frequently the young ones in the presence of their parents, thereby to excite in them a laudable emulation to follow in their footsteps.<sup>3</sup>

As to the results of Xavier's work Baldæus speaks as follows:

The Paravas, ever since their union with the Romish Church, are such zealots in that religion, that there are scarce any hopes

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* p. 607.

<sup>2</sup> Father Brou (i. 201) refers to Yule and Burnell's *Glossary*, s. v. "canicopoly." The word seems to mean an "scribe" or scholar, and hence catechist.

<sup>3</sup> Churchill, *Voyages*, iii. pp. 792-3.

of ever bringing them over to our side; their ignorance in religious concerns being such that besides the use of their beads and making the sign of the cross, they know nothing of the true fundamentals of the Christian religion they pretend to profess. In the year 1661 I was ordered to journey from Tutecoryn to Coulang, to visit the churches along the shore and endeavour to introduce a reformation there, but my endeavours proved ineffectual by reason of the great number of popish priests yet remaining in that country.<sup>1</sup>

Elsewhere, speaking of the Singhalese, the same Dutch predikant remarks:

The Brahmans, living in Jafnapatnam or any other part of the Indies, are for the most part men of great morality, sober, clean, industrious, civil, obliging and very moderate both in eating and drinking. They use no strong liquors, wash or bathe twice a day, eat nothing that has had or may have life, yet are much addicted, like the rest of the Indians, to pleasure. Notwithstanding they are Christians, they still carry certain beads, and never marry out of their families. . . .

Though they bear the name of Christians, and know how to discourse rationally of the Ten Commandments and the other points of the Christian doctrine, they still retain many of their pagan superstitions. If you tell them of the Christian liberty in victuals and drinks, they reply that they are not ignorant of it, but as the essence of Christianity does not consist in eating and drinking, so they do not think themselves obliged to feed upon such things as are contrary to their nature and education, being from their infancy used to much tenderer [probably we ought to translate *less gross*] food which agrees best with their constitution and makes them live to a great age.<sup>2</sup>

As the reader will not need to be told, the whole indictment amounts to this, that these native Christians used rosaries and continued to be vegetarians and total abstainers not less than before. In the eyes of the Dutch Protestants, apparently, no convert could be sincere who did not drink arrack and eat beef and pork. It would be hard to find a more sensible answer to such an absurd objection than that which Baldaeus here sets down in all simplicity as if it made a point in his favour.

Again Baldaeus describes the Paravas as being "blind zealots of the Portuguese religion," and he goes on to tell us that when the Dutch became masters of Tutecoryn in 1658, he was employed to convert them, "but without success":

<sup>1</sup> P. 647.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 814.



for when I preached in Portuguese scarce anyone of the Paravas dared enter the church, but remained in the porch for fear of the Romish priests living among them, for though these priests did not then live in the city, nevertheless the inhabitants would carry their children a great way into the country to be baptized by the priests.

I remember that, passing one time through the market place of Tutecoryn, a great number of people at the accidental ringing of a bell, prostrated themselves upon the ground. Whom I asked whether they thought this a fit place for their devotion, when the church was so near at hand, desiring them to follow me thither, they answered that since the church was despoiled of the images and other ornaments by us, they must look on us as enemies to their religion. . . . To be short I found that the whole knowledge of the Paravas, both young and old, consisted in being able to say by heart the Creed, Our Father, the Ten Commandments and the *Ave Maria*.<sup>1</sup>

When we are dealing with a race so simple and uninstructed this is no mean result. It is in any case plain that they knew the difference clearly enough between the Christianity they had learned, and that by which Baldæus sought to supplant it. Moreover, they have remained constant in their Catholicism under even worse trials than those here glanced at. How discerning the native Christians were, is emphasized by the fact that one of the preachers employed by the Dutch was an apostate Portuguese Jesuit, Joao Ferreira de Almeida by name. He had married and joined the Protestant Church. Nevertheless, though this ex-priest was a remarkable linguist, speaking six languages, including the prevalent Tamul, the natives refused to listen to him. It is Baldæus himself who tells us:

After my departure (from Tuticorin), the Rev. John Ferreira Almeida, a native of Lisbon, was for a whole year employed in the reformation of the Paravas, but with less success than myself, they having conceived an odium against him, as one who had quitted that religion and whose *effigies* upon that score were burnt in Goa.

Undoubtedly the secret of this loyalty to the faith, as Baldæus himself half suspected, was the principle which St. Francis so constantly inculcated both by precept and example, of thoroughly instructing the children in the rudiments of the Christian doctrine. If the early Jesuit missionaries seemed to be more successful than the friars who

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* p. 648.

had preceded them, the difference probably lay less in any increase of zeal or of courage, than in the superiority of their methods. Father Brou has supplied many charming descriptions<sup>1</sup> of the catechetical instructions to children which Xavier found to be so powerful an instrument for good. The experience, not only of St. Francis himself, but of the minister Baldæus, and of many in more modern times, *e.g.*, Père Coubé, bears uniform witness to the precocity and the intelligence, the retentive memory, and the curious sense of responsibility exhibited by the tiny native children, particularly among the Paravas.<sup>2</sup> As we know from the Saint's letters, the children were his great allies, rendering him substantial assistance even in the Christianizing of their own parents. That his instruction of adult converts must in many cases have been rather perfunctory, seems to follow inevitably from the conditions of his apostolate. But so long as he was able to organize and to leave behind him an effective scheme of catechism for the children, there was no such very grave reason to despair of the permanence of the conversions made even in the most hurried of his flying visits. It was the children who held the key of the situation. It is quite possible that the Saint learnt from experience how little was to be gained from any protracted discussion with adults. Once the will to believe had been implanted, not much more could be effected even by a prolonged residence than the learning of a few prayers and practices of devotion. To secure such results the children were as good or better workers than he, while by leaving the further developments in their hands, the great missionary was free to push on to other fields of labour, where the fiery zeal of an apostle was needed to break down the barriers of custom, prejudice, vice, the diabolical hatred of a higher law, and, in many cases, fatalistic indifference. This probably is the real secret of the "restlessness" which has so often been charged against Xavier by his critics. Had he stayed in one spot, the whole ten years of his missionary life would not have sufficed to transform even a score or so of utterly uneducated natives into intelligent Christian believers. Whatever they were capable of would probably be brought out in them by agencies of the humblest kind. The one important point was that he should make provision for the per-

<sup>1</sup> See *e.g.* vol. i. pp. 194, 204, 208, &c.

<sup>2</sup> See Coubé, *Au Pays des Castes*, pp. 27—44.

manence of some form of catechetical instruction. From the beginning to the end of his career this seems to have been the Saint's clearly recognized plan of campaign. Without venturing to say that this has not been adequately appreciated, it is at least remarkable that so many of his non-Catholic critics, and not a few even of those of his own faith, have persistently ignored this point of view. In all his Indian work the immediate help which he demanded was not so much that of priests to administer the Sacraments of Penance and the Holy Eucharist—it would almost seem as if he thought that the majority of his adult converts were not yet ripe for the frequentation of the Sacraments—but of some lay-Brother, of a scholastic not yet ordained, men not learned, but devoted and reliable, who could be trusted to organize the catechisms which with a little supervision would then develop of themselves. Of course, summaries of faith and prayers in the vernacular were needed. The "Christian Doctrine" was the prime necessity of all. And it would almost seem as if the compiling of this were the only work which could anchor Xavier for any length of time to one spot. He could not make a beginning until he had his Creed and Commandments and his simple prayers. But for the rest he was content, like the great Conquistadores of the New World, to take possession of a vast province, to hoist a standard and leave a tiny garrison, knowing well that years must elapse before the full tide of Christian life could pulsate through its arteries.

If St. Francis did say to himself that apart from some actual miracle of God's grace it would need a couple of generations before a village of pagans could be transformed into a village of Christians, shall we believe such a theory to run counter to experience? And supposing him to have held any such view, can we be surprised that he should decline to wait in one spot for a result which only time could effect? Far better that his energies should be expended elsewhere in making some fresh assault upon strongholds where only one of his own heroic temper could hope to make any impression.

In any case it would seem to be a narrow and utterly mistaken view to regard Xavier's conquests as ephemeral. He knew that the work needed seconding, he knew that the days would soon come when a body of priests would be required to settle in the territory gained in order to organize some sort of parochial life, to preach and to administer the Sacraments. But for the time being catechetical instruction

could supply all that was strictly necessary. The priests, he believed, would be provided, as reinforcements became available, even though he himself at first had practically no one to send. And so far as we can trace his work in Japan or the Moluccas or in Southern India and Ceylon, his expectation was justified. Certain it is from what the Protestant minister Baldæus has already told us, that the edifice built by Xavier was solid and well secured. He had not accomplished all himself. But in due course of time other missionaries had succeeded him there, as he had foreseen, and they had known how to develop the work according to the lines laid down. How completely his traditions were adhered to may be seen by a most interesting description which Father Brou has quoted from the narrative of Father Pierre Martin, who visited the country about the year 1700, while the Dutch were still the scourge of all professing Catholics near Cape Comorin. This is the account which Father Martin gives of what he saw:

One of the things which contributes most to make this mission remarkable among the rest, is the care which is here taken to teach the Catechism to children. This holy custom has been maintained inviolate in this part of the world ever since the time of St. Francis Xavier. He was convinced that the faith could not fail to strike deep root in the hearts of the people if from earliest childhood they were properly instructed in the mysteries and the commandments of our holy religion. The sequel has shown that he was not mistaken, for there is no other province in the Indies where one finds more of the fear of God, or a deeper attachment to Christianity than among the Paravas. From the moment, when a child, I might almost say, begins to prattle, down to the age at which it marries, it is compelled to go to the church every day, the girls in the morning after sunrise, the boys in the evening before the sun has set. First of all they recite in common the ordinary morning and evening prayers, after which they are ranged opposite each other in two choirs and remain seated on the floor while two of the best scholars, one in each group, stand up in the middle of the church, and in the form of question and answer repeat the whole Christian doctrine. After this first repetition, in which only these two speak, they proceed to ask questions of the two choirs, who so far have been listening to them, and their questions are answered by all in chorus. (Further, this catechism which they learn, includes not only the explanation of the mysteries and the commandments, but also the manner of going to Confession

and Communion, and a method of performing all the duties of the Christian life. When the Catechism is over they all kneel down again to say an act of contrition, and after having recited the *Salve Regina* and a prayer to their guardian angels, they ask the blessing of our Lord and of our Blessed Lady, and the assembly disperses. This practice is kept up not only in the places where the missionaries reside, but in all the other villages, where the chiefs, acting as the priests' deputies in each church, gather the children together and make them go carefully through the whole lesson as I have just described it.

It would seem from the accounts given by modern travellers that these more primitive methods of instruction have now passed away; but that the Paravas still remain Catholic does not admit of a doubt. Père Coubé, in his interesting little volume, *Au Pays des Castes*, paints a most attractive picture of the relations between these good and simple natives and their *Swamis*, and if Catholic testimony be deemed suspect, Mr. Edgar Thurston, in his authoritative and official *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, quotes several witnesses as to the Catholicism of the Paravas:

It is noted [he says] by Mr. S. P. Rice<sup>1</sup> that the fishermen who live in the extreme south are devout Catholics, and have preserved the Portuguese names by which their fathers were baptized into the Church, so that, incongruous as it sounds, Jose Fernandez and Maria Santiago are but humble folk, catching fish in a primitive way, with no more clothing on than a small loin-cloth and a picture of the Virgin.

And further he adds:

It appears that the Portuguese treated the Paravas with great kindness, permitted intermarriages, and even allowed them to assume their surnames, so that we find amongst them many Da Limas, Da Cruzs, Da Andradas, Da Cunhas, &c. They gave the chief of the Paravas the title of Dom and allowed him the exclusive right of wearing a gold chain with a cross as a badge of nobility.<sup>2</sup>

And Mr. E. Thurston adds, "The name of a recent hereditary chief or Jāti Talaivan or Talaivamore of the Paravas was Gabriel de Cruz Lazarus Mocha Vas."

On the western side of Cape Comorin we have just the

<sup>1</sup> S. P. Rice, *Occasional Essays on Native S. Indian Life*, 1901, quoted *Castes and Tribes*, vi. 143.

<sup>2</sup> Casie Chittie in *Journal R. Asiatic Soc.*, vol. iv. 1837, as quoted by Thurston, *Castes and Tribes*, vi. 146.

same testimony to the fidelity of the Catholic fisher-tribes; for example the following:

In Pearson's *Memories of Claudius Buchanan*, p. 238, there is a letter dated Nov. 1st, 1806, which says: "There was, last year, an insurrection of the Nayers in Travancore against the Rajah. Three battalions of the Nayar body-guards revolted and sought to kill the British Resident, and the Rajah, and the present Minister. Colonel Macaulay fled to Cochin. The Rajah called in the Christian fishermen from the coast to defend him against the Nayers. They assembled at Trevandrum in immense numbers, each man armed with a short bludgeon."<sup>1</sup>

We might add other testimonies proving the continuity of the present flourishing Catholic missions in Ceylon with the converts of Xavier's time.

It would take us too far if we attempted to discuss any of the other interesting questions connected with the missionary work of St. Francis in Southern India. There is one point that I specially regret my inability to deal with here. It is the reproach of fanatical intolerance which is so often levelled against Xavier by his agnostic critics, some of whom go so far as to say that the tradition of blind hostility to paganism, which he initiated, is responsible more than anything else for the outrages upon missionaries and the obstacles so often put in the way of their work by the savage races whom they seek to benefit. Appeal is made to such a description as the following, which does not seem to have been an isolated incident in his career. Speaking of Xavier's stay at Cochin towards the close of 1548, one of the witnesses in the cause of his canonization deposed that:

Consumed as he was with zeal for souls, the Saint sent the children of the Christian doctrine in every direction to search for idols, even in the most hidden places. They smashed them up, trampled them under foot and dragged them through the town. This was meant as an object lesson for the pagans and neophytes. Such ignominious treatment was necessary in order to impress upon them the truth that the gods of the Gentiles were only wood and stone and unworthy of any sort of worship.<sup>2</sup>

This particular incident, as Father Brou points out, took place at Cochin, which was strictly Portuguese territory, and

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in V. Nagam Aiya, *The Travancore State Manual*, vol. ii. p. 154. Trivandrum, 1906.

<sup>2</sup> Quoted by Brou, *St. François Xavier*, ii. 70, from *Monumenta Xaveriana*, ii. 456.

where, consequently, paganism had no reasonable claim to toleration. But to interpret rightly similar conduct on the part of St. Francis at other periods of his missionary career, we have to form for ourselves a true idea of the really degrading character both of the Hindoo religion and of very much of the Buddhism which the Saint encountered in India and in Japan. Here again Father Brou has supplied us with a most necessary sidelight. He has seen that, to estimate Xavier's attitude aright, the reader needed fuller information, based upon unexceptionable sources, concerning the real moral and religious character of the paganism with which the Saint found himself in conflict.<sup>1</sup> The ideal Buddhism of the sacred books was one thing, the polytheism and immorality, not to speak of frauds and superstitions of the grossest kind, which it tolerated in practice, was quite another. In this, as in many another matter, the background is an essential part of the picture, and Father Brou has rendered the greatest service to the lovers and devotees of the dauntless Apostle of the Indies by the reliable information which he has given about all these matters, while investing them at the same time with no small literary charm. We are glad to be able to announce that an English translation of this admirable biography has already been taken in hand and is making rapid progress towards completion.

HERBERT THURSTON.

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g. vol. i. pp. 190—193.



## *The Church and the Heretic.*

The Papacy was for hundreds of years suzerain over Kings, and the Holy Roman Empire was its armed defender. It is now the head of a world-wide voluntary association, which wields no sword but its faith, and which owes nothing to secular Governments.

*The Papacy and Modern Times*, by Canon Barry, p. vi.

IT is a testimony of the remarkable skill with which English statesmen of Reformation and Revolution times managed to identify the Catholic religion—for long centuries the only religion in the land—with foreign domination that the lie they started is still running to-day. It is easy to see now how certain Catholics in the days of Mary and of James played into the hands of those who wished to array the sentiment of patriotism against Catholicism. Still the occasions were grasped with a far-sighted wisdom abundantly justified in the result. The fear of Rome has survived the decay of Protestantism. The Church is dreaded and disliked, not because her teaching is thought contrary to a dearly-loved Bible, nor because she seems to foster forms of devotion alien to the English spirit, but because she is held to grasp at civil dominion and to be the foe of freedom and prosperity. The terror of Giant Pope may still, for all I know, haunt the non-Catholic nursery, but it certainly dominates the imagination of the adult Britisher, who, however indifferent he may have become in regard to religion, still retains a warm affection for his money and his life. The grasping, tyrannical, cunning and cruel spirit of Rome forms the substance of the weekly vapourings of the Protestant gutter-press,—the organs of those "Leagues" and "Alliances" and "Federations," which still find their profit in feeding the fires of bigotry with the fagots of untruth—but if the influence of this teaching reached no further than *their* public there would be little need to notice it. The ditch is the sure and ultimate goal of such blind leaders of the blind. But unfortunately this same historic fallacy, being sometimes serviceable for political ends, has found periodical support amongst the

governing classes of this country; otherwise, one would have thought, the utter impotence of the handful of Catholics in England since the Revolution would have caused it to be dropped. We are reminded by Mgr. Ward's great work, *The Eve of Catholic Emancipation*,<sup>1</sup> how the statesmen of the early nineteenth century used the "Catholic Question" as a pawn in their dreary political game, whilst in Mr. Wilfrid Ward's *Life of Cardinal Newman*,<sup>2</sup> we see the same phenomena exhibited at the time of the so-called Papal Aggression. Again, Gladstone, in the seventies, found the fear of Rome a useful weapon wherewith to smite those who rejected his Irish Universities Bill. The recent Eucharistic Congress in London and the debates on the alteration of the King's Declaration, gave further occasion for a display of the old traditional dread. And lastly, in this present year of grace, as a desperate political move, responsible English politicians have raised the cry once more and have not scrupled in pursuit of their party game to ally themselves with a rancorous faction in Ireland whose creed may be summed up in the simple phrase—"I believe in the Battle of the Boyne," and whose whole *raison d'être* is blind, unreasoning, unChristian hostility to Catholicism. There has rarely been seen sadder evidence of the depths to which the spirit of Party may sink. "We know the hells declared," sings the bard of the movement, "for such as serve not Rome." "If Home Rule be granted," a Brighton correspondent assures the editor of the *Morning Leader*, "tens of thousands of Protestants would be robbed of their property and cruelly tortured to death." And to audiences actually engaged in persecuting Catholics and accustomed by hoary tradition to discriminate against them on account of their faith, this ridiculous, malicious, craven foreboding was echoed in every key from hundreds of pulpits and platforms during the late political campaign in North East Ulster. Always the implication was the same, falsified though it be by all Irish history and all contemporary experience,—put a Catholic in power, and he will abuse that power to rob and persecute his non-Catholic neighbour. It is the creed that matters. The spectacle of a handful of Catholics in England under the rule of an overwhelming non-Catholic majority—a majority, too, which in the past has grossly misused its power—does not disturb the

<sup>1</sup> Three Volumes. Longmans. 1912.

<sup>2</sup> Two Volumes. Longmans. 1912.

Orangeman's sense of political justice, whereas he shivers at the thought of sharing in a Government which would be placed and kept in power by voters who are mainly Catholic. Let Nationalist Ireland turn Protestant and repudiate the Pope, and (judging always by the chief arguments they advance against Home Rule) the Ulster minority will be content to unite with it.

This, as the latest, is perhaps the most striking illustration of my contention that the agitation against Rome is largely a factitious product, begotten of political exigencies and nurtured, not on observed facts in the present, but on the records of a remote and misinterpreted past.<sup>1</sup> False history, it has been said, and bad logic are the main supports of Protestantism. Yet how little chance the illiterate multitude has, in this non-Catholic land, of getting a correct knowledge of historical facts and basing correct inferences upon them, may be imagined, when even the educated continue to scan the past in the light of their modern prepossessions, and when impartial non-Catholic historians of the relations between England and Rome are few in number and of comparatively recent appearance. Till late years the great Protestant Tradition held the field at school and university, and still more recently the equally baseless Anglican Tradition has received a greatly increased support.

Apart then from those afflicted with the religious mania called bigotry (which, let the Eugenist note, *is* very often hereditary), and from the indifferentist multitude which has to be stimulated to anti-Catholicism by appeals to its fears, there is, it must be confessed, a considerable body of educated opinion which honestly finds in the very idea of the Church, or in the records of her history as they understand it, or in the writings of her defenders, much that forms a stumbling-block to its acceptance of her claims. Many have never learnt or cannot grasp the Catholic point of view. They differ from us in some matters

<sup>1</sup> The desperate eagerness and persistency with which the one incident in recent times which could in any way be twisted into a semblance of cruel and arbitrary action on the part of the Church—what is known as the McCann case—was and is still exploited by anti-Catholics, serves emphatically to prove this point. Regarding that case we need note only two facts, first, that the Church was bound to point out to McCann (as Nathan pointed out to David) that according to his own rightly instructed conscience he was living in sin and should regularize his position; secondly, that in the Church's teaching the legal effects of the contract were not affected by this declaration.

of principle which leads to still wider divergence in application, for the Church is like some elaborate architectural design which, unless viewed from the correct standpoint, may seem a formless and distorted mass of masonry. All that we can hope to do with such people is to trace our differences to their ultimate elements and to show how, granting the Catholic premises, all else follows naturally and logically. Inasmuch as their opposition is honest, and springs from a zeal for truth and freedom, genuine though misdirected, this at least is due to them, and although we cannot hope to disarm that opposition except by bringing them to our point of view, still the results of such an exposition will be worth the effort, as sparing the time and energy otherwise wasted on disputes about details which are but the inevitable consequences of varying principles.

And here the Catholic apologist may pause to call attention to one disadvantage, from the controversial point of view, of having to defend an institution so widely distributed in space and time as is the Catholic Church, in an age when the growth of historical knowledge has so wonderfully revived the past and when the modern facilities of communication brings the news of the world to each one's door. In a very real sense the sins of our fathers are visited on us their children, and we are united with our brethren of the faith for worse as well as for better. Whilst we are proud to claim the glorious heritage of the Catholic Church, her exploits in the social as well as in the religious sphere, the civilization she has built up, her humanitarian conquests, her preservation of the highest ideals and the saintly lives which she has inspired, we find ourselves heirs as well to all the mistakes and follies and crimes which in God's Providence the human element in her constitution has been allowed to commit during the long course of her history. Not a scandal that leaps to light from some musty clerical memoirs, not a slip of some professing Catholic in lands semi-civilized, but is sedulously noted and docketed and cast into our teeth as the natural fruits of Catholicity. The Catholic of to-day sees his faith held responsible for the extravagances of every crazy visionary, the sins of every unworthy priest, the low social development, the dirt, the cruelty, the ignorance, the idleness—phenomena due to a variety of causes, racial, climatic or political—of some backward people who happen to be Catholic. No attempt is made to allow for differences of mentality, of oppor-

tunity, of education, of national ideals: the whole traditional series of charges reeks with malice and unfairness. If fault is to be found with France, it is a "great Catholic country": if fault is to be found with the Church, lo! France "has repudiated Catholicity." The Saints, no doubt, were admirable persons, but that was because they could rise superior to their creed, and whenever the Church succeeded in half-civilizing a barbarian, his uncivilized half must be put down to her influence. So the modern defender of Catholicity has to bear the united onset of all the ends of the earth and all the ages of the past. No attempt is made to show that his faith works evil effects in his own time and surroundings; no proof is attempted that the faithful and detailed practice of his religion, the application of his Catholic principles to his daily conduct, his frequentation of the Sacraments, his reverence of the clergy, his obedience to the Pope, result in making him a worse citizen; no modern instance is given of a Catholic in these islands abusing, on account of Catholic teaching, official position of any kind to ill-treat those under him. The wonder is that in face of such prejudice and unfairness the truth of Catholicism manages to emerge at all.

Yet, as I have implied, when all unfairness in argument is avoided, there often remain certain real difficulties in seeing the truth of the Church's claim. The City may be set upon a Hill, and conspicuous enough in itself, but observers are sometimes short-sighted, and there are mountain-mists besides to obscure and conceal. Men, too, have a faculty of seeing what they expect to see and of missing what they are not on the look out for. And so it is a very prevalent opinion, in the minds of those who would repudiate the grosser charges against her—cruelty, greed, pride, superstition, and immorality—that the Catholic Church is anti-national, is unduly restrictive of freedom, whether of thought or action, and only lacks occasion to develop into a tyranny.

Now this impression, as suggested above, seems to be derived partly from an imperfect reading of the New Testament, partly from an unscientific survey of Church history, and partly from a misunderstanding of the later teaching of the Church in regard to her relations with those outside her fold. In respect to the first possible source of error, the Catholic view is that the Scriptures contain a record of the fact that God Almighty, in historical times, assumed

human nature, lived and died in Palestine, and rose from the dead, and, before He left the earth, founded an institution which to the end of time should be His ordinary agent in conveying to mankind the revelation of His truth and the benefits of His Incarnation. That institution is the Catholic Church, which has its chief Pastor and its centre of government at Rome. Now if this conception is true, clearly an institution so founded and commissioned has paramount claims upon the reverence and obedience of the human race. All men in this hypothesis are obliged to join the Church of God, and conform to her teaching and government. Only those who deny the existence of God or the truth of Christianity can deny so reasonable a conclusion. Possessed of this conviction, the Catholic Church has never hesitated to claim to be the sole depositary of God's revelation, the ultimate judge as to what men must believe and do in order to please their Creator, even though by this claim she implicitly condemns as false all other institutions which profess to represent Christianity. She could not do otherwise and remain true to her commission. No Christian can deny—God being All-Wise and All-Powerful—the possibility of such an institution, but all must deny the fact unless they admit the claims of the Catholic Church, the one body on earth that combines the characteristics of Unity and Universality. The Church then is not displaying pride or arrogance in endeavouring to win the adherence of all non-Catholics. She is far from believing that such outsiders will necessarily lose their souls, but she knows that the truth she teaches with certainty and the means of grace which she so freely dispenses will make their salvation much more secure. The Charity of Christ urgeth her. Yet she so respects the rights of the consciences to which she appeals in God's name, that she condemns all employment of force or unfair means in the conversion of the non-Catholic. Faith which is a free gift must be freely accepted with an adequate understanding of its meaning and its obligations. She is intolerant of all error, especially of what contradicts the divine truth confided to her care, she can admit of no compromise with falsehood in any shape, but she knows how imperfect an instrument for the acquisition of truth is the ordinary human mind, and she makes every allowance for invincible ignorance and incurable prejudice. The non-Catholic, therefore, must own that, granting the Church's claim, her attitude towards the individual—whether heretic

or unbeliever—is right and natural. Those who condemn what they call her exclusiveness, her rigidity, her uncharitableness, her proselytizing spirit, ignore the conviction with which she is inspired and which she draws from the words and works of her Founder embodied in her traditions.

On that same conviction, moreover, is based her attitude in regard to those groups of individuals which we call States. I need not discuss that attitude here in any great detail: it will be enough to point out what follows from the character of the Church as a supernatural though visible society, drawing its membership from all the varied nationalities of the globe. These consequences will obviously vary according as the State accepts or rejects the divine character of the Church. In the first hypothesis the State, which owes to God obedience and worship just as the individual does, is under the same obligations as the individual is towards God's representative. Hence a Catholic State, representing a Catholic population, theoretically must support and further the interests of the Catholic Church, for the State being instituted by God in the natural order cannot but fall in with all the purposes of God. Hence there is nothing contrary to justice in the State establishing and giving public preference to that form of religion which it believes to be the true one. Just as no member of the community may justly foster a false religion, neither may the community as a whole. This conception of the duty of the State was, as we shall see, universally accepted in undivided Christendom, and it even survived the break-up of the Reformation, as is evident from the various "establishments" still existing, Protestant as well as Catholic.

The case in the second hypothesis is very different. A State and a people who do not accept the fact that the Catholic Church is the one Kingdom of God upon earth, cannot be fairly required to treat it as such. In a community of this sort the Church Universal must be prepared to take her place with all other religious organizations and submit herself to the common law, happy indeed if her unique claims—her world-wide spiritual jurisdiction, her independence of the State in origin and her irresponsibility to the State in action—do not excite the jealousy and the persecution of the civil authority. This change of attitude, according to circumstances, may seem to give some colour to the charge that the Church, aiming in reality at final dominance, may advance or withhold her pre-



tensions but will never abandon them, whereas the fact is that the alteration of policy is determined by her circumstances rather than by the volition of the Church. Her function is to hold everyone, individual or community, to the performance of their duty, but the duty must first be fully recognized by the parties concerned. It is not she but her Founder who decrees that she must be helped by the State and not hindered in the functions she was created to perform, and if the State helps the Church, it will be because the State realizes that this is the will of God. The ideal condition of things, then, is that both powers should work in harmony at their appointed tasks, and that whilst the Church, inculcating obedience to law, adds a moral sanction to civil legislation, the State on its part should aid the Church in enforcing by material sanctions such ecclesiastical enactments as prevent grave injury to the Christian commonwealth. It does not, of course, belong to the civil authority actively to promote the faith: that would be an undue interference with the work of the Church, akin to that of Joseph of Austria, the "Sacristan": its duty rather is to show its faith by the securing of full opportunity for the growth of God's Kingdom through the removal of impediments. The Christian religion in this ideal condition of things is recognized as the chief bond of Society, a bond which should be preserved intact.

However, since the disruption of Christendom and the consequent spread of infidelity, the ideal of Church and State uniting in a common pursuit of God's interests has passed away, seemingly for ever. Even in nations predominantly Catholic, the civil power is never whole-heartedly with the Church, and, moreover, there are generally enough dissidents amongst the citizens to make toleration a matter of justice. The secularized State no longer feels it a duty to support the one true religion because it seems to have lost the idea of religion altogether, and so the Church has to accommodate herself to a wholly isolated life, such as she led in the days before the conversion of Constantine. She has to deal once more with a heretic State, a community which, as we may see in much legislation on the question of marriage, is gradually rejecting the old ideals of Christianity. She can, therefore, no longer claim a position of privilege on God's warrant as the true religion, but must justify herself and secure the goodwill of the State by showing that in practice, so far from producing incivism, her doctrines make even for the temporal

welfare of the community. There is little difficulty in doing so in regard to the present, for good Catholics are not notably worse citizens than the rest of the community. And if they have from time to time to make a stand for principle against some encroachment of Cæsar on the domain of conscience, that is no more than other Christians do who feel that they must on occasion obey God rather than man. But she has the records of the past to face and to explain, for her adversaries say that, whereas now she is fettered and hampered by the anti-ecclesiastical spirit of the age, she showed her true character in days when she was in power. The ideal Church suggested above, wholly occupied in saving souls, is hard to recognize in that powerful organization which pervaded all ranks of society and mingled in all the business of life, which resisted Kings and ruled Kingdoms, which ruthlessly bore down all opposition to herself, and claimed the whole earth as her fief. Apart from exaggerations and misstatements of fact, there is enough in the charge to merit careful examination, especially the point of the Church's treatment of heretics. How are we to reconcile the militant Church of the Middle Ages with the modest and peaceful bearing of the Church of to-day?

I must recall what has already been suggested, viz., that whether physical constraint can be used on behalf of the Church, depends on her finding herself in surroundings wherein such constraint is considered the natural thing by the community and a matter of duty by the civil authority. For beyond the temporal penalties which she can inflict upon her own clergy, such as deprivation of position and benefice, confinement to monasteries and canonical penances of the sort, the Church has in herself no means of applying physical constraint, no apparatus of soldiery or police such as forms the ultimate sanction of civil law. She depends for such enforcement of her will on the recognition of the community of its duty to help her. If then we find her freely calling upon the civil authority to repress rebellion against her teaching, we must infer that in those days the preservation of her teaching was thought to be necessary for the well-being of society. It is not generally thought so now: still less was it thought so by society at large during the first three centuries of Christianity. Its acceptance as a principle lasted for a well-defined period of history, when Europe was practically Catholic throughout, and when in consequence Church

and State were able to work in greater harmony than ever before or since. Then the civil power felt it to be its duty to maintain and defend what it recognized as the one true Church, and that Church claimed the corresponding right to be upheld by the civil power against all her foes. This alliance is the normal and natural state of things, but the wisdom of some of the practical results of it, we, after some further centuries of experience, may fairly question. No doubt the first heretics, who were apostate Catholics, *i.e.*, revolters against a system with which was bound up the stability of human society, might rightly be considered serious disturbers of the public peace, and punished accordingly. But there was no need to inflict upon them the irrevocable penalty of death, however in harmony such punishment was with the spirit of the age, and the analogy by which Bellarmine and Suarez, following the lead of St. Thomas,<sup>1</sup> strove to justify this severity, cannot be pressed without justifying also a similar penalty for many other grievous sins.

How are we to account for the insistence with which these famous theologians claimed for the Church the right to put heretics to death by means of the civil power? Perhaps it was because they flourished at a time when society was visibly dissolving under stress of the assaults of the new theology. In self-defence almost they had to urge the violent suppression of heresy. Yet against the success of this policy in sundry quarters, *sc.* that of the Inquisition in Spain, may fairly be set the obloquy resulting to the faith through its accompanying barbarities. It is to be regretted, too, that the great scholastics mentioned above and others of their way of thinking, should have had to frame their doctrines in days when heresies of the anti-social type were so prevalent. Their writings and conclusions, drawn from the facts of the day, have been held to express the settled mind of the Church, instead of being theories based upon the observation of contemporaneous phenomena. They read the mentality of their

<sup>1</sup> St. Thomas, 2—2, q. 11, a. 3, compares heretics to coiners: the former tamper with the faith which is the life of the soul, the latter with what is an aid to temporal life. As, therefore, coiners may be justly put to death [a revelation itself of the spirit of those times!], so may heretics. But by parity of reasoning, those who, like writers of bad books, lead others into sin, kill many souls and are worse than murderers. Ergo. St. Thomas' doctrine is put in more reasonable form in 2—2, q. 64, a. 2, where treating formally of the penalty of death for *sin* he demands two conditions for its lawfulness, a sin which is a crime against society and the actual need for society so to punish it. Everyone will admit that, supposing heresy to be such a sin, the Christian State may justly punish it so.

age into the constitution of the Church, and because all contemporary thought was still dominated by the ideal of the Holy Roman Empire, with the spiritual and temporal powers united in one moral personality for the advancement of Christendom, they imagined that what made for the integrity of the Church in that condition of society—*sc.* the means at her disposal to repress domestic rebellion by force—belonged to the essence of Christianity.

We are suffering to-day from those theories of theirs. In an age to which the ideas of authority in religion and certainty in belief are very unfamiliar, the Church is represented as only waiting for the opportunity to torture and burn all who refuse credence to her claim. Few stop to think that the heretics whom Bellarmine and the others had in mind were her own rebellious children, over whom alone she could claim jurisdiction, and that the penalties they assigned to them were a reflection of the spirit of their time, equally visible in the writings and practice of non-Catholic bodies.

No Catholic can blame those distinguished men for not being in advance of their age, but we do blame those critics who persist in declaring that their doctrines have always prevailed in the Church. I feel safe in asserting that the Fathers generally do not uphold the *jus gladii*,<sup>1</sup> and I am equally confident that few modern writers will be found to declare that the Church has the right of visiting heretics (*i.e.*, apostate Catholics) with physical torture or death. "This idea of the execution of heretics," writes Professor Pohle in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (under "Toleration") "had not the slightest connection with the essence of the Church or her constitution, and to the primitive Church such a penalty was unknown." *Ecclesia abhorret a sanguine*: her rule is maternal, and though she may justly punish her disobedient children *pænis temporalibus*, even against their will, her severities have always a remedial character and aim at the reformation of the delinquents. The canonists who still uphold the old view base their opinion either on the authority (in this case of little weight for the reasons explained above) of Bellarmine and others, or on what they conceive to belong to the Church as a "perfect society," or on their interpretation of certain pronouncements of the Holy See. Of these writers we may respectfully say that they know not of what spirit they are. They wish to vindicate for the Church in our modern surroundings a course of action which could find its justification

<sup>1</sup> See *Les Études*, Oct. 5th, pp. 136, 137.

only in a state of society widely different from this, a time when whatever tended to overthrow the Church, such as open and obstinate heresy, was thought to shake also the basis of civil authority. They do not see that with the passing away of a united Christendom, there has disappeared also a whole host of rights and privileges which were then freely recognized as belonging to the one and only true religion. They do not realize that even were the world to become Catholic again, it will never become medieval. Before the Reformation, although the recognition of the Church by the State was a thing right and good in itself, there was always a danger of confusing the two organisms and attributing to the spiritual power what properly belonged to the secular: thus the world was occasionally too much with the Church; one happy result of that most unhappy revolt is that we have now a fairer and less obstructed view of Christ's holy Spouse, a more accurate notion of her spirit and functions, than the sixteenth and seventeenth century canonists were able to frame. Happily, that is recognized by the majority of modern theologians, of whom Père A. Vermeersch, in his exhaustive study of the subject,<sup>1</sup> gives an imposing list. He quotes, moreover, Cardinal Cavagnis, once Professor of Public Law at the Roman Seminary, as testifying that the great bulk of theologians of every age deny to the Church the power of the sword, and he shows at great length that, not only were the great authors of the sixteenth and seventeenth century mistaken in their teaching on this subject, but that the early Fathers and the canon law itself give no support to that doctrine, nor has it any sure foundation in reason. No Catholic denies that the Church has been instituted by God as a perfect society, supreme in her own order, possessing of herself everything necessary for her well-being, endowed, therefore, with the power of expelling from her communion obstinate rebels against her rule, and with the right to punish these and lesser offenders amongst her children by temporal penalties of a remedial character. Such rights her supreme pastors have always vindicated for her in the face of enemies who would subject her essentially to the civil power. But the right to inflict grave physical punishment, much less death, on heretics and apostates, cannot be shown to be in any way necessary to her, but is rather alien to her spirit of motherly tenderness. Although a "perfect society" from the first, she did not possess that power during the first three or four

<sup>1</sup> *La Tolérance*. Pp. 73, 74. Beauchesne. 1912.

centuries of her existence, yet never did she flourish and spread so wonderfully as then.

It is therefore, we must own, a regrettable thing that even a few modern writers should venture to advance claims on behalf of the Church which can be made to lend colour to the grotesque picture drawn of her by her adversaries as a cruel and bloodthirsty tyrant. Her power is "for edification," and it is a mere travesty of her spirit to represent her as clinging tenaciously to the supposed right of inflicting the irremediable fate of death upon her disobedient children, as if from reliance on the "secular arm" she had acquired something of the secular disposition. At best the discussion of subtle questions of the sort, conducted in an atmosphere out of all contact with living realities, is an idle process, and can easily become highly injurious to the interests of truth. We have unfortunately one instance very much to the point. In a book published in 1901 a Roman professor, Father Marianus de Luca, S.J., whose work was to lecture on the Decretals or collections of Papal ordinances, thought it necessary to assert, on behalf of the Church as a "perfect society," the abstract right to inflict death for heresy. Padre de Luca is long since dead, and his treatise, like many another professorial text-book, has disappeared from the lecture-room with its author, but his ill-advised contention has won for itself a vogue which would hardly be accorded to another Gospel. Only those who have anything to do with controversy know how frequently this little section of a large book is made the text of diatribes against Rome, and the proof of all the evil that is said of her. It has been cited in the German Reichstag, to the no small detriment of the body to which de Luca belonged, it has been exploited by the "liberal" press on the Continent, especially in Belgium and Holland, it is quoted by Anglican divines anxious for anything to justify their opposition to Rome, it formed the main argument in the charge brought by the *Rock* newspaper against the Jesuits in this country,<sup>1</sup> though repudiated by the defendant in that *cause célèbre* as a "monstrous anachronism," it still figures constantly in newspaper controversy to this day. It doubtless forms, in the case of many to whom it is represented as a declaration of the fixed and unalterable mind of the Church, a real obstacle to the acceptance of Catholicism. Although it may, unfortunately, be paralleled from the writings of one or two like-minded moderns, the use made

<sup>1</sup> See *Vaughan v. The Rock*. C.T.S. 1d.



of it outside the Church is thoroughly dishonest. It can no more be held to represent current Catholic teaching than do the extravagant assertions made by certain old "papalist" writers to the effect that in the Pope is vested the supreme temporal Lordship of the world. Let the Church be judged by what she is and does. Considering her commission she cannot but be anxious to save her children from error and to correct them when wrong. Her attitude towards those outside the fold, although intolerant in the sense that she will not compromise what she is divinely assured to be true, is practically tolerant in the extreme. Were she in power to-day she would seek to suppress by force none of the liberties dear to this age. There is nothing in her spirit to show that she would go beyond the well-ordered civil State in checking the licence which would dissolve society. She is a voluntary association, her members are won to her by the evidence of truth and the power of grace, and they are held by the same means. But she does not consider, any more than the State does, constraint in the interests of righteousness, an evil or imprudent thing, although she may, as God Himself does, suffer for a time the tares to grow with the wheat.

But although she cannot enforce it, we are told, the Church insists as a right upon submission to her teaching.

Does the intellectual obedience she claims really trespass upon due liberty of thought? Not surely any more than does the multiplication-table. The truth which she conveys and guarantees is that which makes us free. Why then is the world arrayed against her? For the same reason that it opposed her Founder. *Mundus eum non cognovit*. The perfect humanity of Jesus prevented those of His contemporaries who had not good-will from recognizing His divinity. They believed neither Him nor His works. And so the very obvious humanity of the Church, the stumbles and crimes of her earthly constituents, blind the eyes of the indifferent or hostile observer to the striking miracle of her age-long persistence and of the success with which, in spite of human corruption of every kind, she has preserved intact the truth of her Lord's teaching and the ideal of His life. He has so arranged her providential course that faith in her is left free. But faith once freely accepted cannot be freely rejected again. In the attempt to do so lies the sin of heresy. Faith implies a contract. Those who believe must wish to believe, to start with, and must will to believe to the end.

J. KEATING.



## *Those of his own Household.*<sup>1</sup>

MADAME CORENTINE.

### CHAPTER XXI.

BY the time Simone awoke, the church was full of shadows, and even the four rows of granite pillars were in darkness. Not a single prism was reflected from any window on the low walls; the only light which penetrated anywhere was one long golden beam from the setting sun, which slanted across the empty nave like a streak of fire.

The girl started up from her knees, thinking at once that her father and grandmother would be anxious.

But a special Providence watches over such things, and when she came in unperceived through the half-open gate of the courtyard, Madame Jeanne and her son were just concluding their business in the brown room. They sat facing each other, discussing Simone, at the inlaid walnut wood table, loaded with account books.

The worst was over, the acute stage when two people, each with a separate grievance, are thrown into contact and taunt each other with their pain. For different reasons, she because of her elastic nature, and he out of disgust and indifference, had reached the point of being able to discuss their ruin with comparative calmness.

"You see," said Madame Jeanne, "that the calculations I made during your absence, as well as my poor worried brain would allow me, tally with yours. We shall have enough left to live very economically with no superfluities . . . particularly if we keep on this house."

"If only we can!"

"I will make every sacrifice to do so, if you wish it so much. And then, even in real poverty, living in this great, empty, mortgaged house, we can still keep up our dignity. You won't leave me, Guillaume?"

He made a vague gesture. "I can tell you nothing yet.

<sup>1</sup> Translated from the French of René Bazin, by L. M. Leggatt.

I must think it over well. There is no immediate hurry. For the time being I want you to keep as much of all this from Simone as possible. She is going to leave us, and she must not guess what straits we are reduced to."

"No. Well, Guillaume, I shall regret the child with all my heart."

"Good Lord!" cried the poor man, "and what about me?"

They went down, their minds full of the absent Simone, and feeling already equal to the task of appearing as usual before her. They kept their word. There was a strain of something heroic in the L'Héréec nature, like the granite of their native soil. During dinner they racked their brains for every sort of amusing anecdote and Breton tale which had not done duty before, and from the depths of their sore hearts managed to smile and make projects for the future, till Simone was really deceived.

"Perhaps I was mistaken after all!" she said to herself. It's only a slight loss, which father will make up at Paimpol."

L'Héréec, indeed, made a point of talking of Paimpol, and of how he must start at three, and arrive at a certain hour to meet such and such persons, &c. But when the meal was over, he complained of headache, and instead of smoking in the garden as usual when the evening was fine, he suggested taking Simone a walk in the town.

"Why in the town?" asked Madame Jeanne. "If you want anything, Fantic can go."

"No, I want a walk. We shan't be long. It will do me good."

His mother did not believe him. She saw he wanted to talk to Simone quite alone, with selfish enjoyment of his child's society, and her heart ached as they went out together. But she made no sign. He wanted to be alone with Simone, but it was to bid her good-bye in what he meant to be their last interview together.

Since the morning he had resolved to leave Lannion. What possible life could there be for him, when the Mill was sold, and he had not even the resource of work to deaden memory? Could he bring himself to share the remnants of his mother's fortune, wasted by his own fault, without contributing anything of his own? Could he withstand the perpetual sight of the brick building in the distance, dumbly reproaching him with its spirals of white smoke above the

familiar poplars, and the faces of his neighbours, who had watched every step of his gradual downfall? No, he must go. He must get some employment, however trifling, if he had to ask work of his late clients, and search the whole of Brittany to get it. He could surely find food and shelter in some town where he had no past associations to live down. It would be terrible to feel himself a homeless waif, his mother at Lannion, and his wife and child in Jersey, but anything was better than remaining in idle uselessness where he was, reduced to envying those who were formerly in his pay. . . .

But there is no depth of human despair and hopelessness without one ray of light, however tiny; one gleam of hope remained. Very distant, very faint was the glimmer, but it gave him some measure of courage to think of a possible future. He told himself that on some distant day, after other ordeals, he might perhaps find some spot on Breton soil whence he might make some sign to his exiles, and where perhaps they would come to him and let him end his days beside them.

It was a hard task to keep all this hidden in his heart, and to spend his last hour with Simone without confiding in her, letting her think that they were to meet again, if not immediately, at any rate before very long! . . . But it had to be done. No one must know of his plans—no one must be able to oppose them. . . . At such crucial moments of our lives the best and most hidden part of our nature is the main-spring of our acts, and we become simple and loving as children. This was what Guillaume L'Héréc realized in his hour of trial. As soon as he found himself alone with his daughter, in the streets of the town, save for a few belated people strolling along, he realized that in compensation for having to conceal his plans from her, he owed her all the arrears of fatherly love which she had never had. He felt that he ought to tell the secret of his life to the girl who had come to tell him full of a special hope, and who, alas, was going back disappointed of it.

With no preamble, knowing that his first words would explain all, he began to tell Simone of the part which she did not, or could not remember. He quoted, without revealing where he had found them, phrases from the book, incidents of her babyhood, calm, happy records, in which her mother's name constantly came uppermost. He spoke almost

in a whisper, leaning down to her, as they walked through the deserted town, both wrapped in a mist of memories. He was deeply moved. An ineffable consolation soothed them both, and they thrilled to the same echoes of the past. The joy and relief to the dreamy, morbid Breton of finding a kindred soul and breaking the long silence was so great that it seemed as if his heart would burst like an overstrained bud, and fling out its blossom and fruit to the fresh air. Her joy was to feel the full tide of paternal love, and the unmistakable regret for his absent wife. They were going to part, and this last hour was to be the sweetest of their common memories. They were going to part, and they understood each other for the first time. Familiar objects, always dearer when about to be left for ever, brought back to both, old and forgotten memories, God's blessed mercy to those who have strewn both sides of their life's way with sorrow. The elm-bordered Guer, the bridge over the valley of Tonguédec, houses with old sign-boards spelled out long ago by Simone's baby lips, the manifold noises of the streets, the sound of cocks crowing to the moon in enormous garden fowl-houses. To-night the town spoke to them with its myriad voices. The air was warmer than in the morning; Autumn was lapping the last of the dead leaves in a gentle slumber.

Simone listened to her father, with now and again an answering word to show that she was listening gratefully and was touched to think she had become his child again.

Meaning only to look at the old familiar places, they had gradually walked right round the town, and found themselves in a road leading home. Although all the streets of Lannion are so much alike, the mere fact of knowing themselves near lighted shops, likely to meet more people, seemed a check on their conversation. A friend nodded to L'Héréec, who returned the salutation, and suddenly the charm was broken. The idea of separation seemed more poignant than ever, now the tender confidences of the past were checked. By a common instinct they unlinked their arms and walked a few inches apart.

Suddenly, as if awaking from a dream, Simone's heart began to beat. She guessed and understood everything. She saw clearly now, the soothing words were no longer in her ears. The different incidents of the day, Madame Jeanne's agitation, her father's deep and sudden emotion, all these were so many proofs, and she felt as if a loud voice were cry-

ing in her ears, "Your father is ruined, he is going away for good. This is good-bye for ever. And your mother has not been recalled from exile because he has no means of supporting her!"

She took hold of her father's arm, to save herself from falling. Oh! the horrible vision! It refused to be dispelled. Her father was going, before to-morrow night he would have left Lannion, and the irreparable would have happened. What was she to do? Who would help her? Her father was sure not to listen; he would deny it, and treat her as a little girl who cannot be trusted. She felt certain he was not coming back. In the light of the shops she could see his gloomy eyes, full of some new resolution which had driven out their dreamy look. He was silent, and did not even ask if anything were wrong with her. He began to feel worn out, the load was off his mind now, and he had sunk back into his old taciturnity.

With one accord they hurried home by the nearest way. Their tender talk had given place to a few occasional words hastily exchanged between long intervals of silence. They were in sight of the house, a dark mass between its two moon-lit gardens. L'Héréec opened the little gate.

"Nine o'clock!" he said, "poor mother must have felt very lonely all this time." He ran upstairs, suddenly reminded of the old lady, and accusing himself of ingratitude.

Simone watched him disappear. Then she crossed the hall, and went into the kitchen where Fantic had been waiting to shut up the house. The servant, dozing in a low chair, her head nodding on to her breast, rose at the sound of footsteps, and turned up the wick of a tiny lamp on the table.

As she perceived Simone, her great round black eyes under their sleepy lids assumed an expression of loving anxiety. Although she had but little intelligence, her instinct of affection warned her that there was trouble in the house. As the pale young girl came towards her, finger on lip, she felt as if her master or mistress must be lying dead upstairs.

"Listen, Fantic," said Simone, "I want you to do me a favour. Go at once. . ."

"Wherever you like, Mademoiselle. How pale you are!" she interrupted.

"Fantic, it is a favour to me, and to my mother, whom you used to be fond of."

"Poor lady! Yes, Mademoiselle: wherever you like."

Fantic gazed at Simone in bewilderment, as the girl noiselessly took two sheets of coarse paper down from the cupboard and wrote out two telegrams at the table. One was addressed to Captain Guen, Perros Town, and the other . . . Simone's fingers trembled and her writing became almost illegible as she formed the words: "Madame Corentine L'Héréec, *La Lande Fleurie, St. Helier, Jersey.*"

"Run, run, Fantic, don't let anyone see you or hear you go. Take these to the telegraph office, there's only an hour before closing time."

The servant folded the two sheets of paper, put them in her bodice, and taking off her wooden shoes, which she carried in one hand, went out of the courtyard.

Simone stood leaning against the table, frightened at what she had done. Her heart beat to suffocation, and she unfastened her summer coat. A sudden temptation came over her to recall Fantic; she could still do it, the servant could not have gone farther than the top of the road. . . . She is turning. . . . Now she has reached the office. . . . She has entered . . . The clerk is taking the telegrams. . . . Poor Simone was so bewildered that she took two or three running steps to the door. Then she stopped, and putting her head in her hands, strove to realize that it was too late to change her mind. Fantic must be on the way back already, her wooden shoes clicking along by the wall. The words were flying to Perros and Jersey. Grandfather and mother would soon be as agitated as Simone. And to-morrow? What then?

The sound of a door closing upstairs recalled Simone to herself. The die was cast, so why waste any more regrets? It was better to be brave. . . . Father was leaving Madame Jeanne's room. . . . Grandmother was alone. . . . Simone, after thus hesitating, went upstairs.

Madame Jeanne was knitting a winter shawl in coarse black wool. She was sitting by a fireless hearth, and on the mantelpiece stood the white porcelain lamp she always used to work by at night. She went on working, her mind running riot, but her face as calm as usual, when Simone came in and stood beside her footstool.

"Grandmother," said the girl, "I have something very serious to tell you."

Madame Jeanne slowly raised her head, and let her knitting drop on to her lap.

"What now?" she said, "what has happened fresh?"

"Grandmother, you think father is only going for a few days to Paimpol?"

"So he says."

"Well, I don't believe it. There is something strange about him, his words, and his looks, I don't know what, but I'm sure he doesn't mean to come back. I offered to stay till his return, but he wouldn't let me. You see, it's no ordinary journey; father is going away for good."

Madame Jeanne put her hands on the arms of her chair, and turned her old head, weighed down with grief, towards the black mantelpiece. "Everything is possible," she said.

"So then," went on Simone, "I had a sudden idea . . . I don't know if you will forgive me, but I did it for all our sakes . . . Grandmother! I've telegraphed to Jersey . . . My mother will be here to-morrow!"

Madame Jeanne clutched the arms of her chair with her wrinkled fingers.

"Oh, grandmother, do tell me I was right, do, I beg of you."

No answer.

"You don't know," went on the girl, "my mother is rich! She has worked hard. If money is wanted for the Mill (I fancied I gathered that much from father), she would give all she has, I know! . . . Father would not go away . . . and we could all be happy here together!"

She spoke without any hesitation now, opening her whole heart. She revealed to her grandmother what some instinctive feeling of delicacy had kept her from telling her father, that Madame Corentine was rich now. She had not liked to ask him if his poverty were the obstacle between man and wife. Now she waited, trembling with suspense, for the verdict of the revengeful, implacable old woman, whose hostility to Madame Corentine was so well known.

Madame Jeanne drew herself up and looked at her grandchild, but there was no longer any anger nor reproach in her gaze. She even seemed inclined to pity and admire the poor child so unconsciously drawn into a family tragedy, but she did not answer Simone's eager questions.

"Go and rest, child," was all she said, "I will sit up, in case he starts to-night. I believe, as you do, that he means to leave us for ever."

The young girl bent over her.



"Grandmother, do you forgive me?"

Madame Jeanne pressed a long kiss on her forehead.

"Good night, my child," she said, in a voice of utter exhaustion, "Good night! . . . Life is very hard. . . Leave me now."

Simone left the room, still troubled, but relieved at having said all that was in her heart. As she passed the corridor window, she saw the night was clear and fine, and her thoughts went out full of love to Grandfather Guen and to her mother who by now had read her child's appeal.

#### CHAPTER XXII.

Whither is the vessel bound? It comes from Ploumanac'h. By the light of the moon on the open sea she may easily be recognized by the heavily built deck, the two short masts, and the brown sails dyed in oak-bark. No trawling-net trails in her wake, no towing-line floats on the water; her broad bows rise and fall on the swell of the waves like the breast of a black swan. A boy, sitting astride of the bowsprit, sings as the ship goes on her course. It is Yvon Le Dû, the cabin-boy, sent by his mother. On the middle thwart that holds the mast, sits old Guen, in his linen cap, the flaps turned down that he may see through the darkness. Sullian is steering, dressed in civilian clothes, he is half sitting half lying in the stern, absorbed in thought. They have been gone some time, for no land is in sight. As far as eye can see, the waves are crested with silver, and their hollows are full of blue shadows. The moon is still high and bright in the sky, but soon she will begin to sink.

Guen's heart is overflowing with joy. He feels he must speak to someone, or sing, like the boy, to the stars. But, without turning round, his eyes still looking out to sea, he only says calmly, "Beautiful breeze, hey, Sullian? If we'd ordered it it couldn't be better."

His son-in-law is silent. He is still thinking of the joy of his return, his pretty Marie-Anne waiting for him on the jetty, with a radiant face, all their suspense and anguish forgotten in one long kiss.

Still the ship goes on.

"I think we must be near a sand-bank," says Guen, after a long silence, "I see sand in the water. Suppose we let down a trammel? There are red mullet here in the moonlight."

Sullian is thinking of his baby son, in his white cradle . . . the long-wished-for first born. Marie-Anne nurses him, and is proud to carry him about all over Perros. A smile flits over the proud father's lips.

The ship goes steadily on, the wind filling her sails. Farther and farther behind they leave the coast of France.

"Sullian," says Guen, "we shall be in English waters before three hours, or I don't know my business. Corentine expects us. Then we'll tack at once. I've brought the two shawls Marie-Anne gave me for her. And I think that before mid-day to-morrow, my boy, we shall be at the mouth of the Guer, two hours from Lannion."

"That's right, father," says Sullian.

"We shan't have wasted much time, eh?" says Guen, won't Simone be delighted?"

This time both smiled in the darkness, at the idea of her happiness. They still speak of it every now and then. The moon, grown double her size, has set in crimson light amidst the mists on the horizon line, the sea is dark again, the men are silent. But still the little cabin boy continues his song, astride of the mast.

#### CHAPTER XXIII.

At the first glimpse of daylight Simone awoke. Her first thought was to wonder if her father had gone. She got up very cautiously and put her ear to the party wall dividing their two rooms, papered with garlands of blue roses and squares long since faded to white. L'Héréec was still there, she could hear him walking about. He would not be leaving till the time he had mentioned in the afternoon. The girl began to be seized with a panic lest "they" should not come, or should arrive too late. She counted the hours that still remained and realized that there was none too much time. As soon as she could hurry on her clothes, she went downstairs to ask if a telegram had come.

"Nothing has come, Mademoiselle," said Fantic, "Gote and I have been watching ever since the *Angelus*, and we have our hearts in our mouths at every ring . . . especially me," she added in a low voice, with a passionate glance in which she allowed her long pent-up adoration for her absent mistress to appear.

Madame Jeanne had already been downstairs to make the same inquiries, after which she went out.

L'Héréec went to the works as usual. Simone was left alone; feverish with suspense, she roamed all over the garden, trembling every time she heard a gate open or shut. Every sound echoed in the lonely part of the town where the L'Héréec's house stood. But each time it was either some one selling fruit or a beggar for the bread always distributed on Saturdays. Hours passed, and no news came from either Guen, Sullian or Madame Corentine. Several times Simone climbed up to the attics from whence, through a skylight above her father's room, she could see the shimmering river between the rows of yellowing poplars. It was low tide, but the reflux of the sea was beginning to make itself felt. An invisible current drove all the mud from the banks in one direction, with an even, continuous rhythm. Masses of brown water-plants were swept along in the stream and got twisted into stationary heaps. A breeze began to stir fitfully in the tree-tops, the forerunner of the steady wind which drives little white-winged sailing boats along to the wooded creeks, and thence to the tiny Breton landing-stages.

If only she could catch a glimpse of the long-expected travellers! Perhaps the wind passing through Simone's curls had blown across the ship which carried Madame Corentine!

It is the hour when all the little fishing-smacks anchored at the distant mouth of the canal set out to sea, followed by shoals of hungry mullet, driven along by the tide. Old fisherman Penhoat is already established in his accustomed place behind a rock, with his fish-spear, but there is no sail in sight yet.

When Madame Jeanne and L'Héréec came in at mid-day, one glance at Simone showed there was no news from Perros, or Jersey. The old woman's attitude was enigmatical. She was silent and crushed, as if indifferent to anything that might happen. Yet Simone fancied she caught a fleeting expression of relief in her grandmother's face when Fantic, looking disappointed, brought in the smoking soup tureen, and it became apparent that no one in the house expected either Guen or Sullian to arrive, nor even the poor wife, whose husband was going to exile in his turn.

L'Héréec had no idea his secret was known. Madame Jeanne had not spoken to him on the subject. He still affected to talk of his return, but it was painful to hear him, and his own distress must have been terrible as he discussed trifling details of everyday life.

"You won't forget to have the arbour in the large garden trimmed. Simone found it all overgrown and choked up, and when she comes back next time, you see. . . ."

Tears were the only answer. But the little family group were all of the same virile race, strong to control their emotions, and nothing was said.

Directly after luncheon L'Héréec went upstairs to pack, leaving the two women in the dining-room.

"You see your mother has not come," remarked Madame Jeanne.

"No, Grandmother."

"She won't come now."

"I believe she will," said Simone.

"Why?"

"Because I'm sure Grandfather Guen has started."

Madame Jeanne slowly shook her head, all the sad memories of the past evoked in her mind.

"You are mistaken," she continued, "as is natural at your age; but breaches like that can never be healed, my child."

At the same moment Fantic appeared with a telegram, which Madame Jeanne opened, though it was addressed to Simone, who nodded dumbly in assent. As the old lady read it a flood of crimson rushed into her pale wrinkled face. She held out the paper in silence. Grandfather Guen had telegraphed from the mouth of the Guer these few words:

"All arriving together. Guen."

Simone reddened too, but with excess of joy, and felt afraid her grandmother would take offence at this mute proof of her delight. She bent down in silence for a moment over the telegram; when she looked up again, she saw that no excuses were needed. Madame Jeanne had risen to her feet, and was leaning against her chair till Simone should have grown calmer.

"Come!" she said, directly the girl moved, "as they are really coming, it is for me to prepare your father."

The stern old woman would not admit, even now, that she had hoped to be spared the task; she had doubted whether Corentine would return, and had dreaded putting such a contingency into her son's head. Now things had come to a crisis, and her daughter-in-law was coming back. Something stronger than all the old accumulated grudges and grievances seemed to be forcing open the doors of the old house. Madame Jeanne felt she had had no hand in bringing

the event about, whatever its consequences might be! As head of the family, it seemed her duty to announce it. She went up, followed by Simone, who was torn between joy and anxiety; and they entered L'Héréec's room.

It was strewn with his belongings. At the sight of his mother and his daughter, he started back from the trunk he was filling; it suddenly dawned upon him that they had not come to say good-bye. His face darkened; he leaned against the marble ledge of the mantelpiece with the irritated air of a man whose secret has been discovered, but who means to brave it out to the end.

"What is the matter?"

"Your wife is coming back, Guillaume," said his mother, standing facing him by the door.

He walked towards her in a perfect fury of rage.

"What do you mean by taunting me like this? You think to prevent me from going. If you think. . . ."

"Guillaume," interrupted his mother, "I believe you are going farther than you say. . . . I am not taunting or twitting you. . . . It is true . . . your wife *is* coming?"

"Did you send for her?"

"You know I did not, Guillaume."

"But you allowed it! For nothing happens here without your consent. . . . I don't understand . . . after what we said . . . and placed as we are. . . ."

He turned towards Simone, as if unable to say more before her.

"Well, I let her do what she wished," said Madame Jeanne, "because I knew you were leaving us for ever!"

"Who says so?"

"I know it. Don't try to hide it. I haven't interfered because at heart you have always wished her to return. . . . Well, now she's coming. . . . I count for nothing any longer, my day is over . . . do as you will."

"Father, take her back! I asked her to come!"

Simone went up to him, her eyes full of tears, her hands joined in supplication, and the girl looked such a beautiful personification of mingled hope and fear, that L'Héréec, true to the impulses of his own passionate nature, forgot everything, his mother, her reproaches, their ruin, his intended flight. All he saw was his little girl in an irresistible attitude of prayer. His will power melted from him, and he felt shaken to the centre of his being. He actually smiled at her.

"She's coming, father! . . . She's coming by the river. . . . Grandfather Guen fetched her . . . they may be already in sight."

Moved by one impulse, they both went to the window and leaned out, Simone at one corner and L'Héréc at the other, their eyes fixed on the shining glimpses of the river between distant clumps of trees. The Guer was full up to her banks, the poplars bowing and swaying in the wind. Four great gulls, flown back with the tide, rose on steady wings towards the sun.

Simone stretched out her hand. Her voice sounded as if it came from the land of fulfilled dreams, like that of Marie-Anne when her happiness was coming to her.

"Nothing in sight yet," said the girl, ". . . but they are coming . . . they left Perros at night. . . . Father! look towards the creek yonder. . . . Is it the hull of a vessel? . . . Yes! her bows are black! . . . She flies a blue pennon! . . . A little cabin-boy is standing up! . . . and a man with him, by the masthead! That's Sullian, father! . . . They've come! They've come!"

He was silent, absorbed in a vision suddenly vouchsafed to him, watching the ship as it passed, alternately hidden by the trees, or driven into the middle of the current. Was it bringing him back his lost happiness? Was peace coming back to the wretched old house? Thus much was not for mortal man to say. But L'Héréc felt a wave of joy surging over him that left him dumb.

He still leaned against the window, straining his eyes to see into the distance, and calling down blessings on the head of old Guen who was giving Corentine back to him once more.

Simone, who was calmer, remembered Grandmother Jeanne. She left the window so quietly that her father did not notice her absence, and went up to the old lady, whose face had not lost its set expression.

"Grandmother," said the girl, "won't you make her welcome too? Let us all live together in love and unity. . . . We are not ruined . . . there is no more need for anxiety. Mother will make up for it all. . . ."

Madame Jeanne looked at her, and turned her head aside.

"All the better, my child," she said, "I shall be all the freer to go back to Tréguier."

THE END.

## *Miscellanea.*

### I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES.

#### **Phrases and Philosophies.**

WE all acknowledge that by any other name a rose would smell as sweet as by its own, and yet there can be little doubt that in a multitude of instances it is the name more than anything else that stamps an object with its character, and even determines its fate, so that the doom of a dog that has acquired a bad one is already sealed.

Nor is it only in the ordinary business of life that this is to be observed. Most conspicuously is it the case in the sublime region of science itself, a most notable instance being furnished by the famous phrase, which for so many years may be said to have dominated everything in the history of organic life, viz., "Natural Selection."

Unquestionably the general idea is that on this principle everything is easily explained. So that when any objection is brought as to the difficulty of supposing all that we find in Nature to have been produced by merely natural means, a sufficient answer is at once furnished; and thus it is to the title which it has secured, Mr. Darwin's theory of "Natural Selection" owes the hold it has obtained in the popular mind.

Without question, the idea usually entertained, even by men who claim to be scientific, is that there is no limit to its potency. The most delicate and elaborate mechanisms, the most artistic similitudes and adornments, the honey-comb of the bee, the train of the peacock, are equally attributed to the influence of this ubiquitous force, assumed to be ever at work and on the watch for whatever may be of service in the struggle for existence, and aid its fortunate possessor to survive others; so that, instead of any explanation of the means by which things have been brought about, all is held to be fully accounted for by a mere reference to the power of "Natural Selection"; and yet it should be manifest, even in



the testimony of those who most firmly believe in it, that it is no force at all and can originate nothing. It must needs itself have operated before it can make its mark nor be credited with any efficacy. To take an illustration from a matter already referred to, there can be no doubt that a completed honey-comb is a valuable factor in the life of a bee, and gives it a great advantage over rival insects. But this is only when the structure has been already produced, and so serves for storage of honey and hatching of larvae: till this has been accomplished, no advantage is gained and no other creature placed at a disadvantage. Consequently "Natural Selection" has no chance of doing any work, simply for lack of material to select from.

Rightly understood, the Darwinian theory of "Natural Selection," declaring that the better provided creature is likely to fare better, is very much like a truism, but it is commonly interpreted in quite an opposite sense.

J. G.

#### Pictures "in Chinese."

At the Carfax Galleries Mr. Maxwell Armfield has some extremely interesting pictures in which he endeavours to express himself through the medium of Chinese art-formulæ. We hasten to insist that we have not the arrogance to dream of upbraiding him for doing so, still less, of laughing at Chinese art. Mr. Armfield's reputation puts him beyond the reach of criticism, save from the learned in both English and Chinese art technique. I suppose that any casual visitor will be struck, however, in Chinese art by the relative flatness of the effect, by the highly decorative element, the reduction of human figures to the position of mere incidents in the scheme, the lengths to which elimination is carried, and by what Europeans will call "bad perspective."

We are going neither to condemn nor to panegyryze Chinese art. The only point we wish to make is that it *is* an art; it has its own principles and ideals; and it is the expression of the Chinese mind, reacting artistically upon the identical data which stimulate us so differently. Chinese art is not bad art, nor merely undeveloped art, but different art. It cannot, on its intrinsic tendency, *grow* into ours. Nor by any *correction* of it, could we originate our art. It is an interpretation of nature, such as we do not choose to make,

and perhaps cannot make, though Mr. Armfield is trying to. And very likely the Chinese could not interpret nature as we do, and certainly they do not wish to. We may compare, similarly, Chinese, Indian, Arabic, and European music; and within the European area, Gregorian (say), and Italian opera, and rag-time. A mental dislocation marks one sort off from the other. The *notion* of rhythm, of scale, of quality is different in each case, not the mere success of the reproduction of a fact identically perceived.

Look, for instance, at "perspective" as we know it. It involves the practical premiss that for painting to suggest to us a solid, or distance, it must reproduce on the canvas all the optical illusions under which we labour. Thus we draw all manner of converging lines which, in fact, do not converge: we draw things of identical size each smaller than the last in proportion as they are farther off. It is true we *see* a street narrowing, in the distance, to a point; it is true we see a circular pond as an ellipse; but we know very well this is an illusion, and we mentally correct it. The amount of mental correction we are constantly supplying is enormous. The very illusion is imperfect as an illusion. It is true (we said) that we *see* a street as if with converging sides, and the people on it as smaller and smaller, and have to correct that: but we also see it (though this we do not realize) as perfectly flat and equidistant from us. It is only by an elaborate argument (though lightning-swift, through habit) that we can tell that the lamp-post which *looks* smaller, does so (when we have learnt that it is not smaller) *because* it is farther off. It is reasoning which teaches us that the fluting on a Greek column looks narrower at the sides than towards the middle because the column is *round*. Indeed, we often have to *add* to the illusion in order to get ourselves to produce a desired idea. Thus if you asked most people whether a Greek Doric column were perfectly cylindrical, they would probably say yes; though here, when it is pointed out, the entasis is actually visible: in the rest of the building, however, even when we look at it with instructed eyes, we cannot perceive that it is really full of fine curves, which we unconsciously assimilate; these mechanically *create* a new illusion, to frustrate one of the illusions of the senses; for though we can never, save mentally, correct the illusion which suggests that receding parallels converge, we can (by creating a counter-curve) correct mechanically the illusion which

suggests that perfectly straight lines sag or bulge, which, of course, a Greek architect could not tolerate.<sup>1</sup>

This, however, was no concern of, say, an Egyptian artist, who never started from the premiss that to suggest to the mind what a thing *was*, you must paint that distorted caricature of itself which it *looked* like. If he wanted to draw a man fishing in a round pond, he drew a round pond, and would have been scandalized by an ellipse. Similarly, had he seen a "perspective" drawing full of people of different sizes (because meant to be at different distances) he would merely have concluded that they were of different ranks or of unequal importance generally. The Cretan methods of suggesting distance are well known. Japanese art often, without any use of perspective, suggests with incredible success vast distances; and if the present writer has to confess that he but recently, and with extreme suddenness, but with finality, "saw" the point and meaning of Japanese art, that is only because he had been foolish enough, before, to try to read its interpretation of fact "in European" instead of "in Japanese."

It is amazing how willing we are to accept symbols; so willing, that we end by forgetting what they are. Look at an outline drawing of a face! Who ever saw anything like that? Who ever saw a face with a black line all round it, and no colour, no shadows, no "texture"? Mentally, as we look at the portrait, we abolish the one, and supply all the others. A monochrome is better: it includes some "modelling" (still illusory, because flat). Yet who, in *rerum natura*, would stand, say, a dim green face? It were more perturbing, even, than the "wan" horse (Tertullian translated it, with horrible accuracy, *green*) of the Apocalypse! And what of the rigid whiteness of a statue? Were we not instantly at work on it, correcting it mentally, such an object, as the representation of a real person, would be ghastly and ridiculous. These examples are in an ascending scale of approximation to reality (and the statue might be tinted, or wax-work—and then it might indeed *look like* a corpse—or move by clockwork). But modern exigences appear to move by way of elimination. "One only finishes up arguments," says John Ayscough, "with dull persons." Debussy's music, as we said, is all hints. The

<sup>1</sup> As for the immense supplementing, by memory, imagination, and reasoning, of the extremely small coloured surface we actually *see*, we have no space to dwell on that.

Post-Impressionist began in no other way than elimination. We delightedly accept "decorative" work, which suggests all manner of reality in a totally unreal fashion.

The application of these considerations, which can alone impart to them the slightest interest, will be made according to the habitual preoccupations of each.

Meanwhile we see how legitimate an enterprise it is, for a European, to try to express facts in Chinese.

N. K.

### **Does the Anglican Church permit Divorce?**

The Minutes of the Evidence taken by the recent Divorce Law Commission furnish, as such Minutes usually do, a variety of instructive side-lights as well as lights bearing directly on the objects primarily in view. One such side-light was cast by the duel, if we may so call it, between Mr. H. W. Hill and his examiners, over the question of what should be regarded as the teaching of the "Church" on the indissolubility or dissolubility of marriage. Mr. Hill was called to give evidence as representing the President and Council of the English Church Union, but was also stated to be the President of the Canterbury House of Laymen, and President of the Church Guilds Union, and is therefore to be regarded as a particularly representative person. He took the view with which we, as Catholics, are in full sympathy, and asked even for the repeal of the Act of 1857 on the treble ground that it is contrary to the law of Christ; that it is not conducive to the good of civil society; and that it is destructive of family life—and so is a dishonour to our Lord and to His Church. He laid, however, the chief stress on the inconsistency of divorce with the "Law of Christ." It was on this he was taken up by Lord Gorell, the President of the Commission:

What do you mean [asked Lord Gorell] by saying, "There can be no question as to the law of the Church?"—It is so plain. I do not see how anyone could dispute it.

I do not want to interfere with the course of your evidence, but we have had three different views from the Church—from Church people.—Yes, I will deal with these. I have them in mind.<sup>1</sup>

The President meant the views, (1) that marriage is indissoluble, (2) that it is dissoluble on the ground of adultery

<sup>1</sup> See Vol. III., Questions 40317, &c.

alone, (3) that it is dissoluble also for such other grave causes as render joint marriage life actually or practically impossible.

But to continue from the Minutes:

May I ask whether, if there are three views presented to us by different people from the same church, you can maintain that there can be no question as to the law of the Church—I think so. I think you will see my position if I may make my statement. I have said "Divorce for a faithful Church person is unthinkable." Nor is it open to anybody in the Church, from Bishops downward, to go behind the authority of the Church and deduce for themselves exceptions taken from the Bible. They are bound to accept the Church's law.

Mr. Hill went on to argue that this is his Church's law, by reference to a Report of the Lower House of Convocation of York, to a General Synod of the [Anglican] Canadian Church, and likewise to an argument on the true interpretation of the Gospel evidence by the late Dean Luckock, and by Dean Barker of Carlisle. Then the President pressed his point:

Why I do not understand your statement that there can be no question, is because we have the law of the land passed in 1857, and a number of the Bishops voted for it. That would go to show there is a question at any rate.—I am extremely sorry as a Churchman, to be reminded of the incident. . . . The Bishops and Parliament are not the Church. . . . They had no authority from the Church to take part with the State in changing the law of the Church.

May I remind you that one was the Archbishop of Canterbury, the other the Bishop of London?—I should be sorry to detain the Commission to say at length . . . all that Churchmen generally feel about those facts. . . . The Church has raised no question in her corporate capacity. Individual members—Bishops, priests and laymen—no doubt have done things which are contrary to the settled law of the Church.

What do you understand to be the Church?—Our part of the Catholic Church of Christ.

How does the Church make its law plain? By what voice?—Do you mean in what circumstances. I do not follow you. . .

I wanted to know how you said the Church manifests its views?—In her own marriage service and the Canons by which her priesthood and bishops are bound.

Here Lord Gorell dropped the subject. But Sir William Anson, one of the Minority Reporters, took it up later:

You said that the Church in its corporate capacity had never accepted the Act of 1857?—The Church of England.

Yes?—The Church never has.

What is the Church in its corporate capacity? In what way would the Church in its corporate capacity express assent or dissent?—No synod of the Church.

You use again the words "general Church opinion"?—I mean the general Church opinion held by individual Church people.

Church opinion has varied in respect of divorce in the course of the last 150 years?—I can only speak of my own lifetime, and thank God general Church opinion is very much strengthening just now against divorce.

General Church opinion is a temporary thing. You are happy to feel during your lifetime that it has taken a form satisfactory to yourself.

We call this a most instructive passage of arms. Mr. H. W. Hill might perhaps say that he is a layman, not a theologian, and should not have been pressed with such theological subtleties. But he answered very well on the lines which are followed, though not always so frankly acknowledged, by expert Anglican divines. Lord Gorell's point was a very just one. He could not understand how the mind of the Anglican Church could be called sure and certain, whilst its exponents credited it with three different and mutually incompatible opinions; how an appeal to the written words of a Church office or Canon could be taken for more than the individual's idea of its meaning when others took it differently.

It was a perfectly sound point. If Archbishops and Bishops in Parliament and elsewhere vote for a Divorce Law, and the Church to which they belong, instead of calling a synod to condemn and oust them, accepts their act in silence, it must be held to sanction their act, or at least to regard it as not gravely opposed to its own teaching. Yet if this sound principle is applied, what is there that can be taken as the voice of the Anglican Church in regard to almost every controversy that stirs Christendom, in face of the anarchy among Anglican divines?

S. F. S.

## Simplified Spelling.

That English spelling is full of anomalies, none will attempt to deny, so that despite the straightforward simplicity of our grammar it remains the most formidable obstacle in the way of the learner who would deduce the spoken from the written word.

On this point it is needless to dwell, for our alphabet embodies every possible defect which seems to stand in the way of its being adopted as ideal. It has too many letters and yet not enough, for one sound has to be variously represented. Silent letters are frequently in use for which no sufficient justification can be alleged, and, as a result, a great portion of schooltime has to be spent in getting free of difficulties which seem to be purely arbitrary.

Nevertheless, though from the days of the *Fonetic Nus* onwards continual attempts at improvement have been made, none has yet been found which did not seem to make the remedy worse than the disease.

Now, once again, we are confronted with a scheme, which, coming under distinguished patronage, seems to demand special attention, among its advocates being Professor Gilbert Murray, to say nothing of Mr. Andrew Carnegie. To enable us to make up our minds, it will probably suffice to set forth a sample printed by the reformers, which represents Cowper's *John Gilpin*: here are a few verses:—

John Gilpin cist hiz luvving wief;  
 Oerjoid woz he tu fiend  
 That, tho on plezher she woz bent,  
 She had a fruugal miend.  
 The morning caim, the shaiz woz braut,  
 But yet woz not aloud  
 To driev up tu the dor, lest aul  
 Shood sai that she woz proud.  
 So thre dorz of the shaiz woz staid  
 Whair they did aul get in;  
 Sics preshus soelz and aul agog  
 Tu dash thru thic and thin.

Clearly it does not require a Regius Professor to come to a determination in such a case, and even with the approval of Mr. Carnegie, the English-speaking world is not likely to adopt a lingo reminiscent of that once popularized by "Artemus Ward" rather than of any known to literature.



And as to the projected simplification, is it so very certain? Should the new plan be adopted, shall we not all have to learn our spelling all over again, and probably spend a great deal of time in trying to make out what the printed words are intended to mean? Are many likely to agree that nyuez is the more commonsense form of news, or myuet of mute? What is to become of proper names we dare not conjecture. On the whole, therefore, it seems to us that the proposed form will not be generally adopted, and that if it were, no great benefit is likely to result.

J. G.

## II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH.

**The Late  
Dr. James  
Gairdner.**

FREQUENTERS of the British Museum Reading Room are sadly conscious, ever and anon, of the disappearance of some familiar figure whom they have grown to believe almost as much a part of the recognized order of things as the building itself. Since his retirement from the Record Office in 1894, Dr. Gairdner had been an almost constant attendant at the Museum, and down to within the last month or two, few who watched the briskness with which the veteran historian, at the age of eighty-four, moved from bookcase to bookcase and bore away the big volumes of which he had need, could have doubted that his vigorous constitution would carry him on to the end of those studies upon the sixteenth century upon which he was engaged. It must be a matter of deep regret to all lovers of honest research that Providence has decreed otherwise. In all Dr. Gairdner's work, the naturally reverent and religious tone of his mind made itself felt. No non-Catholic history printed in recent times can be more safely recommended than his volume on *The English Church in the Sixteenth Century to the Death of Mary* in the series edited by Hunt and Stephens, and seeing that Dr. Gairdner had waded through the vast collection of official documents calendared by him in the *Letters and Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII.*, he had almost the same minute knowledge of the period as if he had lived in it. Another great service to truth was rendered by his three volumes on *Lollardy*, a work now, unhappily, left incomplete. Neither ought we to forget his editing of the *Paston Letters*, nor the crushing blow dealt to the Froudian legend by the separate re-publication of Professor Brewer's preface digested in the two volumes of *Henry VIII. to the death of Wolsey*. A more kindly scholar for a more unbiassed lover of truth our generation may not hope to see.

**Posthumous  
Bigotry.**

To trade on the cupidity or the indigence of parents with the object of inducing them to allow their children to be brought up in a faith in which they themselves did not believe, is a practice happily confined to those Protestant bodies in Ireland and elsewhere, who probably feel that this is the surest, if not the only means open to them of recruiting their ranks. No doubt, so marvellous is the possible range of self-deception, contributors to the Irish Church Missions, or to the Methodist proselytizing agencies in Rome, flatter themselves that they are doing a good work, and so presumably do those testators who, "in restraint of conscience," arrange to disinherit their relatives should they change their faith. Instances of the sort are of common occurrence, but the strange thing is that these people, who at any rate, are not indifferentist on the point of religion, do not seem to care whether their heirs or legatees become Turks, Jews, or atheists, so long as they do not become Catholics. Referring to two recent examples of this irrational prejudice, the *Standard* of October 4th has the following judicious remarks:—

Disinheriting clauses on the score of religion are becoming more frequent than in the past, excepting, of course, Jewish wills, a large proportion of which have always disinherited children or relatives who should abandon their religion or marry outside the pale of Judaism. In the wills of Christians these clauses are invariably directed against the members of the Catholic Church: and it is a fact worth while noticing, that, in spite of the general feeling that Catholicism and intolerance are things closely united, one has never yet met in a Catholic will a clause of this sort, disinheriting a child for change of religion, or for marrying outside his or her own.

Yet the Catholic, who holds his faith, not on the strength of mere human reasoning, but on the strength of God's word, and therefore knows it to be infallibly true, might, with some little show of reason, provide in this fashion lest his heirs should abandon it, whereas the only consistent attitude of those who base their faith on private judgment is fully to respect the private judgment of others.

**Catholicity  
and  
Tolerance.**

The contention, supported in another part of the present issue, that the true spirit of Catholicism makes for liberty and tolerance, received a classic illustration, as is well known, in the early history of one of the American colonies, when Maryland under the Catholic Lords Baltimore passed the first Toleration Act. This was in 1649, when and for long after the whole

of Europe was deeply committed to the principle that religious uniformity could be, and should be, maintained by force. In 1649, therefore, when Cavaliers and Roundheads in England were at one about the propriety of suppressing Catholicity by fine, imprisonment and death, the Catholic majority in the Maryland Assembly, some centuries ahead of the old world in grasping the significance of the dissolution of united Christendom, passed the following decree:—

Whereas the enforcing of the conscience in matters of religion hath frequently fallen out to be of dangerous consequence in those commonwealths where it hath been practised. . . . Be it therefore enacted that noe person or persons whatsoever within this province . . . professing to believe in Jesus Christ shall henceforth be in anywaies troubled molested or discountenanced for or in respect of his or her religion or in the free exercise thereof within this province nor in anything compelled to the belief or exercise of any other religion against his or her consent.<sup>1</sup>

A significant comment on this even-handed justice was provided the next year by the Puritans of the province who, having themselves been driven out by the Anglicans from the neighbouring colony of Virginia, and received in Maryland with the greatest kindness in 1643, rose in revolt against the Government and substituted for the Toleration Act one which contained this provision:—

That none who profess and exercise the Papistic, commonly known as the Roman Catholic, religion can be protected in this province.

Perhaps a still more significant comment on the action of those old-time Maryland Catholics is being afforded by the "Puritans" of Belfast and their English abettors, whose attitude towards the Catholics of Ulster so perfectly embodies the spirit of the latter enactment.

**The Withdrawal of  
the Mental  
Deficiency Bill.**

Catholic opinion has been so definitely opposed on ethical grounds, not to the object of the Government's legislative project in relation to the feeble-minded, but to its methods and implications, that it is with some relief that we hear of its withdrawal for the Session. Little has been done in Committee to remove its objectionable features,—its looseness of definition, its unnecessary cost (comprising a new Board of thirteen members all with salaries over £1,500 a year!), the arbitrary powers over the liberty of the subject given to magistrates and doctors, and, worst of all, to the Home Secretary himself, its tinkering at results and ignoring of causes, &c., &c.—all of which may be found vigorously exposed and denounced in Prior McNabb's

<sup>1</sup> See *The First Experiment in Civil and Religious Liberty*. C.T.S., 1d.

paper, *The Question of the Feeble-Minded*.<sup>1</sup> But now there will be an opportunity of putting more completely before the public the false assumptions of the Bill, and the wrong principles on which it proceeds. As citizens we are concerned at the spread of feeble-mindedness, although as yet it is far from being a very serious burden on the State, but we are more concerned at the spread of merely material notions regarding human destinies. Men are souls rather than minds and bodies, and if some have to remain "innocents" all their earthly lives they are the surer on that account of life immortal. To speak of such creatures merely as degenerates is to take too narrow a view. At the same time, if such grown-up children cannot be protected by their own families from abuse, it is clearly the business of the State to make provision for their welfare. It is certainly deplorable that the 20,000 mentally-defective children who are taken care of in special schools up to the age of sixteen, should have no help given them after that age. Their case calls for immediate attention, as many of them are cast on the world unprotected. But the provision made should have regard for elementary human liberties. Compulsory life-imprisonment is no doubt a direct way of supplying that defect in our system: judging by the spirit of some of our legislators, it may also prove a direct way to compulsory euthanasia, a method which has the further recommendation of cheapness.

**The Passing of the  
Criminal Law  
Amendment Bill.**

The White Slave Traffic is beyond question a terrible abuse, a reproach to our civilization, the source of wide-spread moral evil and physical misery in the community. One would have thought that legislation to check, and if possible, suppress this foul trade by the only means the State can employ, viz., more efficient police action, would have met with the cordial support of all decent-minded persons. Yet it would appear that some people, so deep-rooted is the distrust of the police in their minds, would prefer those cruel outrages on maidenhood to go on unchecked rather than arm the force with the requisite means of stopping them. This is surely carrying regard for liberty to a fanatical extreme. How can the remote risk of an innocent man or woman, being charged or black-mailed by an unscrupulous constable, be held to outweigh the certain ruin of so many innocent girls, easily preventable by increased powers of arrest?

**The Lash  
for  
Procurers.**

Another curious frame of mind disclosed in the course of the debates on this Bill, was the repugnance evinced to the proposal to flog the detestable scoundrels convicted of carrying on this traffic in human souls and bodies. This shrinking from

<sup>1</sup> Catholic Social Guild Pamphlet, No. 20. C.T.S. 1d.

the infliction of physical pain in punishment of crime is the offspring, partly of a sentimental humanitarianism, partly of a denial of the true Christian notion of penalty as the violent restitution of a moral order violently broken by sin. Punishment is deterrent—*pœna in paucos ut metus in omnes*, as the old maxim runs—; thus it benefits society. It is also medicinal, meant to lead the culprit to recognize his guilt, and thus to benefit the individual. But it is primarily retributive, meant to exact satisfaction for a wrong done, a law violated, an assertion of self-will in rebellion against the Universal Will. Our modern utilitarians cry out against this idea, and refuse to recognize its justice, yet it is at the basis of all penal legislation, and was recognized even by the pagan philosopher who taught the imperative need of expiation. "The greatest of evils," said Socrates, "is for a guilty man to escape punishment."

And when we consider the crime in question, its callous disregard for the sufferings of others, its brutal subordination of the sanctity of the human soul and the dignity of the human body to the greed for gain, we see how fitting it is that the lash should form part of its punishment. Physical penalties, always appropriate to crimes against the person, are never so much in keeping as here.

Peace  
and  
Temperance.

No doubt irrational advocacy of a good cause often does more harm to it than formal opposition, if only because it provokes reaction, and gives occasion to the adversary to obscure the issues. We have an illustration of this in the habitual attitude taken up by the *Eye-Witness*, recently re-baptized as the *New Witness*, on the Peace Question and on Temperance Reform. In its violent hostility to those who deprecate war on grounds which are not ethically sound, that paper has almost come to regard armed conflict as a good in itself, instead of being, as it is, a desperate remedy for a still more desperate disease, a token of the failure of Christianity to regulate international dealings, the result on one side or the other, or on both, of a disregard for justice and morality, the sign, even as is the unsafe state of a Western mining camp, of a faulty civilization. In its hatred of the Quaker variety, the *Eye-Witness* makes no account of Catholic Pacificism, so earnestly advocated by the Sovereign Pontiffs, so thoroughly in consonance with the spirit of Christianity. Still less does it seem to realize, in its war against the "Cocoa" Press, the terrible injury to faith and morality, as well as physical efficiency, due to the prevalence of intemperance in the community. With a singular forgetfulness of the ordinary Christian teaching, it tries to overwhelm in one common flood of ridicule all who are striving from whatever

motive to raise the public standard of temperance and self-control. In pursuance of this unfair policy it has lately returned to its advocacy of "free-trade in drink," relying on its analysis of the figures in the Drink Statistics of 1911, which produce paradoxical results wholly at variance with sound psychology and all experience. It would appear from these figures that convictions for drunkenness vary inversely with the facilities for getting drunk, whence it would logically follow that if every house were a public-house, there would be no drunkenness at all! Instead of examining the returns in order to discover the causes of this startling paradox, the paper eagerly embraces this fatuous conclusion. It is such a deadly weapon, forsooth, wherewith to slaughter the Temperance Philistine. As a matter of fact, the phenomenon is no discovery of the *Eye-Witness's*, but has long been familiar to social investigators. It may be found fully discussed in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (Vol. xvi., pp. 585 and 586). Little research indeed is needed to destroy the ridiculous implication that the more frequent the occasions the fewer the number of falls; the fact, of course, is that drinking-habits are determined much more by occupation, situation and climate, than by any other factors. Drinking is far more heavy in mining districts and seaports than elsewhere, and the reason why Northumberland, Durham and Glamorgan take and keep the lead in convictions is not because their drinking facilities are much restricted, as the *Eye-Witness* claims from the figures. The boot is on the other foot. In those districts licences have to be kept down precisely because of the drinking propensities of their inhabitants. In more sober localities such severe restriction is not necessary.

**The Sadness  
of the  
Agnostic.**

When one glances through (who in these busy days could *read* a work of over 600,000 words?) the recent three-volume *Life of Mark Twain*, one is constantly reminded of St. Paul's phrase in I. Thess. "that ye be not sorrowful like those around you *who have no hope*." An overwhelming sadness seems to have permanently haunted the most widely celebrated jester that ever used the English tongue. Wealth, health, friends, family affection, fame,—all that the world can offer its most favoured children was his, and together with these gifts a most poignant sense of their utter insufficiency. Like St. Augustine's, his heart was restless in spite of them, but unfortunately it never found its true repose. Less imaginative, less sensitive, less exigent natures can feel satisfied for a time with earthly interests, but the soul-hunger of this gifted man seemingly forbade any such contentment. His life is a valuable object-lesson of the results of extinguishing the lights of heaven. What peace can the materialist offer the exiled soul of man?

**Idleness**  
 a  
**Social Crime**

It is gradually being realized that complete idleness, utter unproductiveness of hand or brain, is not only a contravention of God's primal sentence on the race, but also an offence against society. As mankind has to be supported by labour, those that toil not have to be supported by those that do. They shirk their share in the common burden, and very often the result is that the toilers are overworked. That the community is awakening to this fact is evidenced by various projects designed to provide work for the unemployed—work which, in the case of the work-shy, will involve a certain element of compulsion. The latest and most drastic of these hails from that much-regimented land, Germany, and provides machinery for the abolition of the idle class—amongst the poor. In a sense this is fair enough, for the unemployed poor, having no means of support, are an immediate charge on the community. But it is not so commonly recognized that the idle rich are also a charge on the State: they are living on the accumulated results of the labours of their ancestors without themselves adding anything to the productiveness of the community. St. Paul's beautifully simple rule—"If a man work not neither let him eat"—is meant to be of universal application. But the difficulty is to apply it to the work-shy well-to-do. The idle poor man must confess his unproductiveness if he is to get relief: there is no occasion for such compulsion on the idle rich. Perhaps some legislative genius in the future will devise a scheme, whereby these latter will form the main support of the former.

**The**  
**French Church**  
 under  
**Persecution.**

The early history of the Church shows that it is not dependent on a favourable human environment for its successful growth: that it can flourish, in fact, notwithstanding the active hostility of the world. That same divine note has been no less conspicuous throughout her whole career, and it is receiving its latest illustration in the religious conditions of modern France. From a variety of independent sources it appears that the persecution of Catholics, carried on by the Freemason government there, has resulted in a genuine revival of Catholicism. In the *Contemporary* for August, Canon Lilley bore welcome testimony to the fact that "a new sense of religious need is everywhere making itself felt throughout the national life," for "France is still profoundly Christian." An English journalist who has spent the last twenty years in Paris, describes in the October *Hibbert Journal* as "one of the most remarkable signs of the times, the progress made by the Roman Catholic Church in France since the separation." He traces this to the abolition of the Concordat which, although accompanied by the spoliation



of the Church,<sup>1</sup> set the Bishops and clergy free from a connection with the State which hampered their religious activities in every way, and kept them from proper contact with their flocks. The educational deficiencies resulting from the suppression of the teaching Congregations are being rapidly made good, an Association of *Pères de famille* has been organized to check atheistic teaching in the State schools, the supply of vocations to the priesthood has actually increased, Paris especially is the scene of splendidly organized social and religious work, which has brought back thousands to the practice of their religion. It is in this department of social work, rather than in that of politics, that French Catholics are chiefly manifesting their new life. The poor are having the gospel preached to them as never before. Once secure in the support of the democracy, hitherto out of touch with them and largely under the sway of anti-clericalism, the Catholic leaders will, it is hoped, make short work of the atheist clique that misgoverns them. 'So at least the free-thinking journal, *La Lanterne*, thinks, which recognizes *une reviviscence indéniable de l'Eglise*, and publishes the following warning from one of its supporters:—

Quand les Catholiques auront mis la dernière main aux œuvres qu'ils sont en train de créer, quand ils auront embrigadé la jeunesse dans leurs patronages, les ouvriers dans leurs syndicats chrétiens, les jeunes gens de la bourgeoisie dans leurs cercles d'études, il nous faudra bien compter avec eux.

The  
Catholic  
Historian.

The sufficiently obvious fact that an historian possessing the Catholic faith is *ceteris paribus* better qualified to write history than is one who does not hold that "key to the world's progress," receives abundant corroboration in a valuable article which Mr. Belloc contributes to the *Dublin Review* for October, entitled "The Entry into the Dark Ages." After pointing out that the period of speculative writing of history, as contrasted with mere chronicling, began with the breaking-up of Christian unity and consequently introduction of a new faith and a new philosophy, he says:—

Make a list of the great names which mark historical science from the sixteenth to the end of the nineteenth century: they are the names of men who either ignore or when they are better instructed hate, or when they are of a milder temperament despise, or at the very best reject the unifying principle of our European story, which unifying principle is the faith. This anti-Catholic bias of history is a matter curiously missed by most modern Catholics. . .

<sup>1</sup> According to a report recently published by the *Administration des domaines* the liquidation of the goods of the Church has realized nearly 40,000,000 francs or over £15,000,000.

Of one hundred names similarly hackneyed in the field of historical learning, you have not five whose sympathy with and adhesion to the soul of Europe (which is the Catholic Church) can be presumed. . . . This does not mean that a man cannot write history unless he is a Catholic (although that exaggeration is not very far wide of the truth), but it does mean that he cannot write the history of Europe unless he knows what the faith is, and puts it where it should be, at the centre of our system.

It is, as we have said before, essential to the accurate historian, that he should recognize facts, especially great fundamental facts which affect every department of life and thought. Such a fact is the divinity of the Catholic Church. Unless she is accepted as God's Kingdom, supernaturally endowed with indefectibility and perennial life, all theories concerning her growth and persistence must, like Gibbon's, be at least partially untrue. And in her truth the Catholic historian has a standard denied to others for testing the value of every current of human activity and every ideal of human greatness.

**A Plea  
for  
the Workers.**

In the same number of the *Dublin*, Professor T. M. Kettle of the National University of Ireland, discussing the industrial unrest, pronounces strongly and definitely against the

present wage-system:—

What we have got to realize, to absorb into our social philosophy, to get into our bones, as the phrase is, is that the wage-system as at present in operation is profoundly unsatisfactory. . . . The standard of wages is, in general, too low: over a great area it is so low as to shut out the recipients of it, not only from the amenities, but even from the necessities of life.

And he goes on to point out two facts often ignored,—first that, as the workman is paid, not in what he most needs—food, clothing and shelter—but in money, an economic symbol of varying value, his contract is often vitiated by a rise in prices; and secondly, that the hand-labourer, unlike the business or professional man, so far from finding his services better requited with length of service, experiences no rise at all, but, as he grows old, often has to see his wages lessened till he is finally dismissed! Repeated insistence on economic facts like these, so dry and uninteresting in themselves, but of such vital importance to the toiling masses, is necessary if educated public opinion is to be stirred to action. At present many are content with denouncing the attempts, possibly on occasion misguided, which are being made to restore justice to our industrial conditions. Catholics at any rate, whose ethical belief is so clear and definite, should be foremost in this good work. We trust, however, that

the conclusion of the Professor's article will not be taken as decrying concerted action such as is fostered by the Catholic Social Guild. "Any attempt," he writes, "to formulate in the name of the Church, a rigorous and exclusive social programme, and to insist that that alone is sound Catholic policy, must, of its nature, be futile and even dangerous." That may well be so, if we lay stress upon the epithets, yet, as the Bishop of Northampton has shown, it is possible to sketch a social programme on Catholic lines, which without being "rigorous and exclusive" in its details, is sufficiently definite to afford a working basis for united Catholic effort.

**A new  
Oxford  
Magazine.**

The *Blue Book*, a bi-monthly magazine, is one of those literary ventures which are constantly putting forth at the Universities to make a long or a short voyage, according to the success of the original captain and crew in holding together and in enlisting like-minded successors, to carry on when they themselves go down. Judging from No. III., which has a pleasantly varied cargo, and is not by any means "loaded down with rails," this particular craft ought to go far. It has not, like so many of its class, struck the Christian flag, and an unwonted token of conscientiousness appears in a notice to advertisers that no recommendations of any dubious wares of whatever kind would be admitted to its pages. *O si sic omnes!*

**Divinity  
Degrees  
at Cambridge**

By a grace passed by a substantial majority on November 22nd, at Cambridge, the University Divinity Degree is no longer to be confined to Anglicans. From the terms of the vote it also appears to be no longer confined to Christians. Considering that the Rev. J. M. Thompson, who repudiates all the Gospel miracles, is a Dean of Divinity at Oxford, the change will hardly be felt to make much difference. The object of some of the *placets*, as evidenced by correspondence in the *Times* was, in view of such scandals, to deprive the degree of, any, significance. Others felt that the University was incompetent to determine the beliefs that must be considered essential for a Christian—a singular admission of the laxity of faith amongst the members of the Senate. Others again seemed to have been influenced by that blind dislike of "tests" which is the natural outcome of the principle of private judgment. Yet we apply tests before we admit men to the cure of bodies, as Mr. Barker well knows,—is the cure of souls less important? The upshot of it all is that the Anglicanism, represented by the Cambridge Divinity School, can no longer exact a belief in the knowledge which it guarantees by its diplomas: it is ready to declare persons fit to teach who have no faith in what they are teaching.

**The Simplified  
Spelling  
Societi.**

Our remarks last month, on the subject of simplified spelling, have drawn from the courteous secretary of the "Simplified Spelling Societi" a long and interesting letter in explanation and reply. He points out that his society is not for a root-and-branch reform, that it works within the limits of the present alphabet with all its defects and redundancies, and thus escapes the serious obstacle caused by the vested interests of printers and publishers, that it does not aim at being strictly phonetic.

Under our system [he writes] there is considerable latitude: the Northerner may write "gras" and the Southerner "graas." Conferences will have to be held on this subject; and the fact that colonial speech is in peril of straying from the general standard that prevails in this country makes the matter one of urgency. A South African professor recently said that the day is coming when a South African will not be understood in the streets of London.

How simplified spelling will arrest the inherent tendency of pronunciation to vary does not appear. Now, the written language at any rate does not vary. It has become stereotyped by the invention of printing. Pronunciation will vary whether we like it or no, and if spelling is to follow its variations, we shall not be able to communicate with our future visitor from South Africa even by writing. Something might be done to simplify present spelling and remove anomalies, but even here it seems to us it would be impossible to secure general agreement. And without general agreement, *caios wood cwicli cum agen*. Great stress is laid upon the saving of time simplified spelling would cause in writing and in education generally. As regards writing, when we find "usual" represented by "yuezhyual," we have some doubts. And as for spelling, it is best learnt unconsciously by constant reading, and not formally by studying lists of words. But the whole question is an interesting one, and merits more discussion than we can give it here.

### *Reviews.*

#### **I.—THE FIRST-FRUITS OF THE VULGATE COMMISSION.<sup>1</sup>**

WE have much pleasure in extending our hearty welcome to the first important output of the Benedictine Vulgate Commission. That Commission will command at once the

<sup>1</sup> *Collectanea Biblica Latina*, cura et studio monachorum S. Benedicti. Vol. I. Liber Psalmorum iuxta antiquissimam Latinam versionem, nunc primum ex Casinensi Cod. 557, curante D. Ambrosio M. Amelli, O.S.B. Abbate S. M. Florentinae, in lucem profertur. Fridericus Pustet. Pp. xxxiv, 174. Price, 8 fr. (M. 6.50.) 1912.

interest and confidence of English Catholics, from the fact that it is presided over by the learned Abbot-President of the English Congregation. The task laid upon them, that of recovering the text of the original Vulgate as written by St. Jerome, is so vast that it needs some effort of the mind to imagine it ever coming to an end; nor, with this first volume of the *Collectanea* before us, are we quite sure that we have any desire to see an early conclusion. For the end proposed it is really necessary to ascertain the exact character and history of the Latin texts from the beginning to this day. We are apt to think of St. Jerome's translation as practically the beginning of that history; it might more truly be called the final stage, for what remains is merely the story of its superseding the others, and of its own corruption. It was a case of action and reaction; in its very victory it partly succumbed to the vanquished. The really essential point in its recovery, therefore, is to discover and discriminate the old Latin or pre-Vulgate versions, a very difficult task, even with the favouring circumstance that in the Old Testament they are made from the Greek, not from the Hebrew.

Cod. Casinensis 557 appears to the learned editor to contain, besides much else, the old African psalter, revised from the Hebrew and from Origen's Hexaplar texts, and it is this psalter which he has carefully edited, with spelling and the like as in the original, with an introduction, twelve appendices and three facsimiles. The introduction supplies all necessary explanations, describes the manuscript, and explains the author's view. The handwriting in the codex is very small, but quite legible, and profusely illustrated with beautiful capitals, fourteen of which, however, *barbaro ferro, latrociniali animo*, were cut out before the eighteenth century. It contains the whole Bible according to the Vulgate, including the Latin version of Esther from the Septuagint, and a four-fold Psalter, namely St. Jerome's from the Hebrew, the "Gallican" from the Septuagint, which is, alas, the one still printed in the authorized Vulgate, then the psalter which forms the special study of the book, and then the "Roman," St. Jerome's earlier and more superficial revision from the Septuagint. Then comes an appendix containing some short biblical treatises by St. Jerome, and some anonymous ones by an author in whom Abbot Amelli is inclined to agree with Berger and others in seeing a learned Jew of the early ninth century. This may well be so, but the facsimile giving his

account of the Hebrew letters shows that the scribe could not do him justice, but confuses letters and words. The manuscript is of the twelfth century, written for the most part by the skilled scribe Ferro, who puts his seal and mark upon it, as it were, by six times writing the very word *ferro* where it occurs in the text, in elaborate capitals.

The author of the third psalter Abbot Amelli judges to have been Jerome's friend (and then enemy) Rufinus. Few men possessed the learning needed for its production, and there is some reason to suppose that Rufinus may have possessed it, though St. Jerome, if we are to press a passage quoted, implies that he did not know Hebrew. The point must remain very doubtful. The character of the text is the important question, and in the appendix the editor carefully goes into this, taking Psalm xxi. as a specimen, and examining the possible sources as he goes along, with some tables at the end. Other appendices follow, mostly illustrating and confirming the main these. His case is at all events a strong one. Perhaps we are hardly in a position as yet to pass a final judgment upon the old Latin texts. Before that can be, a much more careful inventory will have to be made of the quotations of the early Fathers. For the present we are promised in the *Collectanea* only direct work upon manuscripts. This is most valuable, and there is doubtless an enormous amount to be done in this direction. But the other work is the more laborious, because of the uncritical state of the patristic texts; it is necessary to evaluate the manuscripts and other authorities of each in turn. Such testimonies from the Fathers as those alleged in the work before us will carry rather greater weight when more progress has been made in this department. But we cannot expect everything at once. We are content to welcome what has been given us, and to wish the learned workers long continuance in the *alacri animo ac diligenti cura* of which Abbot Amelli speaks, the great heart and careful scholarship which are alike needed for their mighty task.

## 2.—THREE CATHOLIC NOVELISTS.<sup>1</sup>

This triad of novels—all by Catholics and by priests, all dealing directly with the human elements of happiness and

<sup>1</sup> *Miriam Lucas*. By Canon Sheehan, D.D. London: Longmans. Pp. 470. Price, 6s. net. 1912.

*Come Rack! Come Rope!* By Mgr. R. H. Benson. Pp. viii. 404. Price, 6s. net. 1912.

*Faustula*. By John Ayscough. London: Chatto and Windus. Pp. 332. Price, 6s. net. 1912.

hate, love and death and religion—all the reverse (shall we say?) of academic and "official," however truly each may be a *roman à thèse*—cannot be regarded save as a most remarkable phenomenon. Each one of them must be set at once on the shelves of every Catholic library, and the second of them (at any rate) must be given, this Christmas, as prize or present, wherever the Catholic folk speaks English.

We have always felt a rather shamefaced regret that Canon Sheehan has never written a quite worthy companion to *My New Curate*, which was altogether unsurpassable in its delightful pictures of a life too little known to English readers. "Regret," we said, because the author does nothing else so well: "shamefaced," because we know he wants to make us, not only laugh and cry, but, above all else, think. In the present volume he challenges our thought rather than our emotions. Not that there lack delicious glimpses of Irish peasant life (thus, p. 113); or that, for instance, the scenes between the Socialist student and the Friar, or between Miriam and the Friar, or Anstie and the priest, or Miriam and the New York "Coyote," are anything but dramatic in conception and very cleverly worked out (in the last mentioned, we feared the Canon was, with some slight cynicism (p. 325), rebuking Miriam's sentimental charity: but the street-arab turns out excellently after all, and Miriam is justified. . . .). Moreover, when we say that the author has infused some of the Calvinist atmosphere of Mrs. Clennam, in *Little Dorrit*, into his delineations of some Irish Protestants, we mean to pay him a high compliment (he makes up for this by a most sympathetic and delicate picture of an old astronomer-parson. But do many wives invariably call their husbands by their Christian-, *plus* their sur-name, thus, "John Crossthwaite"?). And his presentment of the caste spirit, which unites the social layers only in their hatred of Papistry, the "religion of the scullery," is quite hauntingly disagreeable.

But it is the whole sinister question of Ireland and Socialism, and, though he only hints it, Ireland and anti-clericalism, which bulks large in this rather episodic book.

Now dare we make one cavil? No stress of circumstances will make people talk as Canon Sheehan makes them talk. Undergraduates, at Trinity or elsewhere, simply don't use linked phrases, containing parentheses, quotations and figures of speech (look at p. 84, or 184). May we hope no Prior



ever spoke to a dying man like the Father in chapter xxx? And we are certain that no business man ever said "aloud to himself":

'Pah! the melodramatic antics of a spoiled chit of a girl! Why should I heed. . . . Come, old Omar, my genuine and only inspired prophet, what dost thou say?'<sup>1</sup>

And then the oaths. Personally, we feel, quite generally, that the day of Dashes is over. "Mrs. B——" bothers us: "188—" quite annoys us: but at any rate, we might expect consistency: often enough in these clerical pages we have an honest damn: but lo, at the most dramatic crises, the sonorous vocabulum dwindles suddenly to a mild elliptic d—.

We doubt whether there is anyone who will not welcome Mgr. Benson's return to historical romance and to the scenes of the English Reformation. Not that we hesitate to place his transcripts from modern life (*e.g.*, the *Necromancers*, the *Coward*) among quite the most valuable of contributions to the true reading of religious psychology. Many a preacher, or director, many an individual inquirer or sufferer or student will have found in them for the first time, and exactly, what he wanted. But also how we need the destruction of myths! Denifle and Grisar have learnedly demolished, for the learned, the Luther-myth; but how badly still are wanted the historical novels, dealing with the German Reformation, or the Italian Renaissance, written with the sure historical and artistic touch, and the absence of special pleading, which belong to Mgr. Benson! Are they not novels which are almost wholly responsible for such true understanding as Englishmen possess of the recent ecclesiastical events in France? Not many problem-books, in Italy, made such a stir, for good or ill, as did *Il Santo*. Mgr. Benson fears he may here have been too sensational. The fear is ungrounded. The times, as he says, were sensational; and he has been far less merciful to our nerves in his novels dealing with our own dull times. He could not deal with an age which contained Elizabeth, Mary Stuart, Topcliffe, Walsingham, Babington, Campion, without filling his pages with tales of martyrdom, of confiscation, of disguised priests and hiding-places, of pageantry, plots, and traitors and gallant chivalry. In these chapters, unusually "historical" even for him (for all the characters save some three are those of real men and

<sup>1</sup> P. 95.

women), has Mgr. Benson outstripped his evidence in his picture of the Queen of the Scots? We can only guess that her fascination must have been as he describes it, if we are to explain the passionate adoration (we can say no less) of her followers. We are glad that the rhythm and sequence of the style seems more cared for here than in Mgr. Benson's recent books; that he has said less (perhaps even so, too much?) of the subjective state of those who are in dreadful suffering, or at the point of death; that he has touched with so restrained a pencil the really wonderful episode of Edmund Campion's presence (he had but recently been martyred) by the side of Marjorie's dying mother; and the whole singularly "supernatural" *motif* of Marjorie's own sacrifice of her lover, first to priesthood, then to martyrdom.

Of quite a different character, and period, is *Faustula*. It reaches its climax within the reign of Julian the Apostate, and is throughout an astonishingly vivid, ingenious, and (we think) truthful reconstruction of a period far too little studied, but winning to-day a rapidly increasing amount of attention. In it we see a society which is, in official theory, Christian, but to a marked degree in reality pagan; there is a brief outburst, under the mysterious Emperor's guidance, of the old worship (remodelled in great part); and then the Galilean has definitely conquered. Fr. Benson shows us the dethronement, in one country, of that religion which John Ayscough pictures for us dethroning the cults of a whole Empire. The exquisite idylls of the earlier parts of the book enchanted us: not a portrait but is touched in with strong and delicate art; the frivolous Faustulus (he had a good heart, and reminds us of nothing so much as of our idea of Petronius, Nero's *arbiter elegantiarum*); the staid pagan aristocrat, Sabina; the wonderful family and home of the Christian Melania; her priest, her sons. Later, when Faustula is driven to become a Vestal, the tone is (necessarily) harder and more cynical; towards the end it rises again, and leaves us in a serene and sacred air. Throughout the treatment is dramatic, and imbued with that almost caustic irony, that unusual sense of the comic side of ordinary, or cruel, or foolish life, which is so notable in John Ayscough, and to a much less degree in Mgr. Benson—scarcely at all in his latest book. And John Ayscough delights in hints and tiny touches. This is a compliment. "One only finishes up arguments with dull people," he writes on

p. 2. Exactly! But then we ask ourselves how far he means us to read between the lines, or to apply his story to our own times? Perhaps, not at all. Yet Mgr. Benson succeeds, precisely *because* he makes his period so vivid and realistic, in making us feel what worlds away we are from the scene when the fight was Rome *versus* a new-born "England." And John Ayscough (partly by the amazing accuracy of his "transcription"—his characters don't talk *like* live people: they *are* live people talking) makes us, by the same means, grasp that to-day we are back in a world where Christ has to fight with heathendom; and that Christian and pagan, though face to face and side by side, are still half mystery each to the other. Our only complaint shall be that, even with all allowance for precocity, training, and nationality, Faustula could not possibly have thought and spoken as she did when first a novice, and only ten. Long experience must have pre-faced that embitterment and disillusion. And, though we do not deprecate all preternatural incident, great economy must here be exercised;—we do not care for the visualized temptation, by Lucifer, of the immured Vestal.

### 3.—THE DICTIONARY OF APOLOGETICS.<sup>1</sup>

This latest fasciculus of a highly important work is itself of the first importance. The article on Grace (by M. Tobac of Malines, a recognized authority on this matter) is, as befits this dictionary, purely positive, and deals with the Old and New Testament data, omitting all such psychological, theological, and even historical developments as are in place in the *Dictionnaire de Théologie*. The splendid article on the Greek Church, which is more in the framework of this dictionary, is in the very capable hands of R. P. M. Jugie, Professor at the Assumptionist Study-house of Kadi-Keuf, Constantinople, while Professor Huby practically reprints, from the manual of the History of Religions, *Christus*, which he edited, his pages on the religion of ancient Greece. It is still the fashion to connect so much of early institutional Christianity with the Mysteries, that this article has clear apologetic value and is in place. Dr. Van der Elst, of the faculty of medicine at Paris, has a comparative study of miraculous cures, valuable to those who hear equated, and

<sup>1</sup> *Dictionnaire Apologétique de la Foi Catholique*. Edited by A. d'Alès. Fasc. viii. Gouvernement Ecclésiastique—Incinération. Paris: Beauchesne. 1912.

attacked, the "miracles" of the Gospel, of Lourdes, and of Christian Science and faith-healing generally. The article on *Man* is of special importance, and is divided into a brief and guarded section, by the Editor, on man according to *Genesis*; a section of the very highest value on prehistoric man, according to the evidence of Palæontology, by the very distinguished anthropologists, H. Breuil, of Paris, and A. and J. Bouyssonie, of Cublac; a section by M. Guibert on the unity of the race, and one by M. Teilhard de Chardin on man in relation to ecclesiastical dogma and philosophy. The apologetic value of this article is obvious. Abbot Cabrol deals briefly and competently with *Honorius*; even *Humility* has a peculiarly modern aspect (for our assertive will-to-live cannot tolerate it); *Hus* is by Father Kröss; and *Hypnotism* and *Hysteria* by Dr. Van der Elst. Father Choupin deals with ecclesiastical immunities, and Abbé Besson with cremation. An extremely learned and complete article on *Idealism* is by Abbé H. Dehove: but in our opinion the most notable of all the contents is that on the *Immanentist* method, of which Father Auguste Valensin gives the genetic account, and Abbé Albert Valensin the application. (Abbé Valensin has also written on the *doctrine* of Immanence.) We have rarely read anything so complete upon this subject, or which gives so accurate a position to that philosopher to whom we owe so much, M. Blondel. M. Valensin succeeds, without sacrificing one ounce of orthodoxy, in showing how much of good is contained, and may be used, in a system too often connected, in our minds, with distressing considerations. A French tendency to be verbose is here corrected (on the whole) by the equally French genius for sub-division.

#### 4.—THREE SISTERS OF MERCY.<sup>1</sup>

Father Russell, in his Preface, says of himself (he was the youngest of six children), "the last arrival has not yet departed," and gives his date as 1834--?. Alas, the date can be filled in now, and the six are re-united. For in death only, and in love, were they not divided. Katherine became Mother Baptist, the pioneer Sister of Mercy in California: Sarah, who took the unusual name of *Emmanuel* when she entered religion—out of love for the Blessed Sacrament—was preoccupied with her work as Superior in various con-

<sup>1</sup> The Three Sisters of Lord Russell of Killowen. By Matthew Russell, S.J. London: Longmans. Pp. x. 310. Price, 6s. 1912.

vents (it was of her that "There's more sense in Mother Emmanuel's wee finger than there is in the Jesuit, the Lawyer, and the President [Father Russell of Maynooth] all together" was said. The Lawyer, need we say, was the Lord Chief Justice! The life of the other sister, Elizabeth, was shorter and full of suffering.

There is about this book an atmosphere of serenity which in no way disguises the extremely hard work done by these three sisters for their fellow-men. It is due, I suppose, to the absolutely unaffected and cheerful piety which characterized all these three lives, and that, too, of the author. We feel that there are many, outside our walls, to whom these pages might come as a kind of revelation of what Catholic life, in the world and in religion, is when it can develop and put forth flower and fruit unimpeded.

In the world, we said; for the book contains many references not only to Father Russell's brother Charles, but to much which will make more complete and truthful our appreciation of Lord Russell of Killowen, of whose biography Father Russell speaks, in his preface, with the least touch of severity. Need we say that the whole book is fragrant with that personal charm which was recognized in Father Matthew Russell by all who knew him?

### 5.—CATHOLIC BOOKS ON SOCIAL SCIENCE.<sup>1</sup>

Socialism and Capitalism represent two vicious extremes, to both of which Christianity is necessarily opposed. In his conflict with both, the Christian runs the risk of being identified by each opposing party with its adversary. Capitalism looks askance at the Christian who is a social reformer and dwells upon the duties of wealth: Socialism is openly hostile to the social reformer who upholds, as a Christian, the rights of property. So all who stand for justice—"the steadfast and perpetual will to render to every man his just right," in old Ulpian's phrase—must rejoice whenever the Christian attitude is clearly defined and firmly established by Christian apologists. The process of setting forth the true doctrine necessarily results in the exposure of the false, and thus human wills are better directed and human energies saved. Both the volumes herein noticed are valuable contributions

<sup>1</sup> *The Church and Social Problems.* By Joseph Husslein, S.J. New York: The America Press. Pp. 211. Price. \$1.00. 1912.

*Christian Social Reform.* By George Metlake. London: Washbourne. Pp. iv, 246 Price, 5s. net. 1912.

to the twofold line of defence occupied by the children of the Church. Father Husslein is mainly concerned with the Socialist front, although he is careful to recognize what deserves reprobation on the other side. And he rightly devotes himself first and foremost to the religious aspect of the question as of paramount importance. The titles of his three Parts indicate his plan. The first, "Socialism and the Church," shows at great length and from authentic sources the differences in principle between Christianity and thorough-going Socialism. The second, "So-called Christian Socialism," overthrows the endeavour to find in the Gospel or in early Christianity any justification for Socialistic tenets, whilst the third, "Catholic Social Ideals," is constructive in essence, showing how the Church's doctrine supports the just claims of labour, and what the faithful children of the Church, notably the great German leaders, Ketteler and Windthorst, have accomplished for the interests of the masses. Particularly apposite is the important chapter which traces the attitude of Windthorst to the Woman-Question.

Mr. George Metlake's work is a history of the Catholic Social Reform Movement in Germany, of which Bishop von Ketteler of Mainz was the originator and the soul. The inspiring record of the great Bishop's life, so far as it was concerned with social reform, is here presented with abundant illustrations from his own writings, and the result is a study of absorbing interest calculated to encourage and guide all who aim at following in his footsteps. His was the first hand that was set to the task of re-Christianizing the industrial world, fallen back into Pagan ideals through stress of Protestant individualism. How he laboured and how he succeeded, by voice and pen and mere force of personality, in bringing to life and action again a whole world of dead ideals, the social activities of the Church in Germany and on the Continent generally provide the best evidence. Both Mr. Metlake's volume and that of Father Husslein should become powerful additions to the Catholic Reformer's library.

---

#### 6.—ST. PAUL'S DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Williams describes his book as "a plea for the re-consideration of St. Paul's doctrine of Justification." He urges that neither the forensic theory of imputed righteousness,

<sup>1</sup> By the Rev. E. J. Watson Williams, M.A., B.D. London: J. and J. Bennett (Century Press). Pp. ii, 159. Price, 4s. 1912.



so dear to the followers of Luther, nor the Catholic theory of inherent and infused justice are satisfactory, the former "postulating a course of action on the part of God which it is hard to receive," and the latter not being acceptable from the point of view of exegesis. He therefore searches for a fresh interpretation which he finds, and (to quote from his concluding paragraphs) states thus:

Δικαιοῦν or λογίζεσθαι δικαιοσύνην is not ascribing righteousness, which is not there, to the man who is, in fact, Godless . . . but a statutory making qualified or eligible for salvation such and such men (even though before they had not been fearing God), who otherwise could never have become eligible, by decreeing that such and such a thing (viz., faith in Jesus) should be the qualification. The word δικαιοῦν does not mean to reckon righteous but to make qualified.

Mr. Williams, beyond rejecting in a single sentence the Catholic doctrine of infused justice, makes no further reference to it. Had he given more thought to the subject, he might have noticed that the conclusion he reaches is, as far as it goes, singularly like the Catholic interpretation. Yet there is an essential difference between the two which is not to the advantage of the new plea. To make eligible for salvation is, as far as it goes, a true description of the process of justification, but it omits to specify the distinctive character which constitutes this eligibility; in other words, it omits the one thing which it was essential for it to indicate. He will say he has acknowledged that the qualification is faith, as appears from the repeated affirmations of St. Paul, that justification is by faith, not by observance of the law. True, but, if justification is making eligible for salvation, there are three elements to be distinguished, faith, justification, salvation; for St. Paul's point is not that faith constitutes justification, but that it is in some way the cause of justification, which therefore is to be distinguished from it. And thus Catholic theologians have explained St. Paul as meaning that faith is the "instrumental cause" of justification, inasmuch as by its appeal to the mercy and promise of God, it induces him to bestow in baptism by infusion the particular gift which is called by St. Paul the "justice of faith," or again, "the justice of God,"—a term that, in view of Rom. i. 17, iii. 21—22; Rom. x. 3 and 2 Cor. v. 21; Phil. iii. 9, must be interpreted "justice bestowed by God." But in what sense can a personal disposition, or inherent state of soul which is not the outcome of a law of right faithfully



observed, but an infused gift of God, be a state of "justice" whereby a man can be called, without violence done to language, a just man? The Council of Trent's answer is that "justification is not a mere remission of sins, but the sanctification and renovation of the inner man by the voluntary reception of grace and [its attendant] gifts; whence from unjust a man becomes just." And it is hard (not to speak of other motives for this doctrine) to find another interpretation which so well satisfies the Apostle's words, alike from their doctrinal and their exegetical side.

---

### Short Notices.

---

MESSRS. Constable's series, **Religions, Ancient and Modern**, and **Philosophies, Ancient and Modern**, have been added to by the publication of **Unitarianism**, by W. G. Tarrant, and **Congregationalism**, by Benjamin A. Millard; and by **Pragmatism**, by D. L. Murray; and **Rationalism**, by J. M. Robertson, M. P. These little books (of which the longest, **Congregationalism**, has 122 pages; in our copy **Pragmatism** stops at p. 76: the Contents places its bibliography at p. 78: it has a preface by Prof. F. C. S. Schiller) are dear at their price (1s.); Dr. Hitchcock gave so much more, relatively, in the 32 pages of his C. T. S. paper on Unitarianism (1d.) that we are once again tempted to ask the authors of that series to expand their packed pages into shilling-volume size. They contain, at present, often too much; sometimes, too little. We fear we have found three of these booklets dull: Mr. Robertson is never dull, and there are few books we find more stimulating than his. We think his field of observation unnaturally circumscribed (in that he leaves so many phenomena unexplained and inexplicable); that he sets up men of straw to knock them down (as that 'mere tradition or mere authority' against which 'private judgment' is said to be set); and that most possible fallacies are contained in sentences like these: 'Every religion sets aside every other: the rationalist only sets aside one more. Every theist has negated a million Gods save one: the rationalist does but negate the millionth' (p. 74). But this was written for one "in the stress of controversy," we think. . . And we regret the harsh party-pleading, and the sneer, which disfigure nearly all this author's religious writings, and confuse the criticism of their scientific aspect.

Messrs. Burns and Oates were fortunate in securing Mr. Alfred Noyes' **Carol of the Fir Tree** (1s.). It is charmingly printed in red and black, with a Botticelli Madonna for frontispiece. It reminds us in letter, rather than in spirit, of Thompson's *In no Strange Country*: 'Holy Land is in your heart. . . And London one with Nazareth.' We hope it will reach many for a Christmas-card.

The theology of Mgr. de Gibergue's **Holy Communion** (Burns and Oates: 7s. 6d.) is accurate; its psychology is wholly unscientific, and its spirituality is of that emotional sort which is not popular in this country and which, we wish, were far less popular in France. Nevertheless, it may be used with profit if it is used with discrimination, if only because it warmly encourages the Church's ideal of frequent Communion for all and meets successfully the usual

objections to that holy practice. It has for frontispiece a dimidiated *Last Supper* by Fra Angelico.

The Italian language is rich in diminutives, and under the title of **Par-goletti Cristiani**, i.e., Christian Babies (Marietti: 0.75 l. per vol.), Padre Boggio has given us in four small volumes Catechism Lessons for parochial schools. These are meant for Italians, and not for the matter-of-fact denizens of northern climes. For the simple children of the sunny south they are possibly well suited; still in some instances at least the Instructions lack clearness and are open to misconstruction. We shall glance at one lesson in each volume. In vol. i. p. 43, the Ascension is thus described in the Italian fashion. A mother and her child witness the ascent of an aeroplane. The boy is delighted at the sight, and wants to learn how to fly; the mother takes the opportunity of describing the Ascension of our Lord by the might of His divinity, and assures her child that on the Last Day the blessed will also fly into Heaven without an aeroplane. In vol. ii. p. 104—106, in simple language the doctrine of the Real Presence is stated in words which even a child can easily understand. But there is a strange omission. The explanation is preparatory to First Communion, and yet not a word is said of the Pope's wish that even children should enjoy the privilege of frequent Communion.

In vol. iii. p. 128, the explanation of Indulgences, a most important point of Catholic truth, does not satisfy us. Even a child can understand that Indulgences are not gained in the same way by the living and the dead. And yet nothing is said to explain the difference between an Indulgence to the living by way of absolution, and to the dead by way of suffrage. Padre Boggio is also open to misconception in vol. iv. p. 42. In the paragraph on Civil Marriage, he assures us that the mayor (*sindaco*) cannot give the sacrament, nor grace. The retort is obvious—neither can the priest. The contracting parties are the ministers of sacramental grace: the priest, by the Church's command, is only the official witness of the sacrament. Surely such an important fact should be clearly stated. These are small blemishes in an excellent work.

The Angelico College at Rome sends us a new proof of its zeal in the cause of orthodox theology in the last book of the R.P. Edouard Hugon, O.P., Professor of Dogma there. **Le Mystère de la Très-Sainte Trinité** (Téqui: 3 fr. 50) follows the lines now customary in our schools and observed by the author himself in his book on the Atonement. It is interesting to observe how, in a work explicitly designated as "purely dogmatic" (p. 32), history and critical exegesis are inevitably assuming an ever greater importance, The Biblical basis of the doctrine here exposed has to be stated with infinitely greater care and with many more *nuances* than of old; and at last the Greek and Latin Fathers are recognized as having approached the whole question from starting-points which were, as often as they could be, diametrically opposed. At every moment an author is obliged to refer to standard works on the Old and New Testaments and on history, if he is to see without anxiety not his argument but its background and foundation attacked. Father Lebreton's quite admirable book on the subject is continuously used by Father Hugon; we implore its author to take every means to bring his unique enterprise to a conclusion. Father de Regnon's books, which make theological history read almost like a novel, are guardedly acknowledged by Father Hugon (cf. p. 364, n.), who, while his extremely lucid and rather academic style lacks, clearly, the vivacity and even gaiety of de Regnon, cannot (we feel) perforce his erudition with all the suavity and

cogent unction of Lebreton. This will be an admirable book for continuous reading in our theological schools as a less strenuous equivalent of textbooks. Nothing that they contain is here omitted; much is included that they cannot hope to offer. We regret that, beside the ordinary analytical *Tables des Matières*, there is no index of subjects, things or persons to this book, and no bibliography. We envy the French language (as we do St. Augustine his *tria quaedam*) its power of expressing as *les Trois Distincts* those three Divine Persons to whom the contentious vocable *Person* must not, until after due discussion, be applied.

An unusual book, *The House of Peace*, by Michael Wood (Longmans: 4s. 6d.), relates in story form the conflict of spiritual forces which human life embodies. The victorious factors are prayer and the life of vicarious suffering. There is more strength here and artistic sense than we usually expect in a book of this sort, and at times there is even a flash of humour. The sentimentality which ruins nearly all modern allegories or "other worldly" tales, is almost quite absent, but still disfigure slightly the conversations and prayers. It is curious that the worldly Mr. and Mrs. Fenton are the best drawn characters. The ascetic and mystical parts are rather reminiscent of Father Benson, and strongly suggest (if we may be forgiven this criticism), that *amateurishness* which characterizes absolutely all Anglican work directly it touches on these subjects. But we are grateful for this story's reminder of the unique value of prayer, and of the existence and activity of spiritual forces in the universe, and of the potency of sacrifice. The slight tale, sketchily worked out in parts, is yet not ill-constructed, and forms a fit vehicle for the lessons it does not profess to disguise.

From Italy we have received *La Comunicabilità del Diritto e le Idee del Vico*: Trani, 1911; *Sull' Idea di una Scienza del Diritto Universale Comparato* (read at the Philosophic Congress at Heidelberg in 1908), Edition 2, Turin 1909; *Il Progresso Giuridico* (from the *Rivista Italiana di Sociologia*, Sept.—Oct. 1911, Rome, 1911); *Sulla Positività come Carattere del Diritto*, Modena, 1911; *Il Fenomeno della Guerra e l'Idea della Pace*, Ed. 2, Turin, 1911; *Il Concetto della Natura e il Principio del Diritto*, Turin, 1908, all by Professor Giorgio de Vecchio of the University of Messina. These books or papers are all highly technical, and will interest specialists. Professor del Vecchio's erudition is known and incontestable, his tone is scientific and calm, an agreeable characteristic in an author who is dealing, after all, with troublesome topics: his standpoint is, of course purely independent and positive. But it is difficult to discuss a highly actual matter like that of war, or a highly abstract one like Nature and the foundations of natural right, and to preserve successfully so complete an aloofness of sympathy as does the Professor. It is unfortunate too, that conditions of thought and education in Italy should prevent one whose reading is so enormously wide, and whose quotations are so varied and accurate from making greater use of the traditional philosophy of Europe and its applications to modern theories and facts, *i.e.*, shall we say, of the Encyclicals of Leo XIII. We do not mean by this that Professor del Vecchio has written against Catholicism, or left our authors unstudied.

An excellent addition has been made to the Irish Catholic Truth Society's "Iona Series"—a collection of small octavo volumes handsomely bound and sold at a shilling net—by the publication of Father Joseph Canavan's masterly study, called *Nicholas Cardinal Wiseman*. In it the life of the great English Churchman is depicted by one who realizes fully all that contributed to its

immense significance and who keenly appreciates the Cardinal's many-sided personality. One small mistake should be rectified in a second edition. On pp. 93, 94 it is implied that "St. Edmund's" the diocesan College where W. G. Ward was Professor of Dogma, is equivalent to Oscott.

From the same Society comes as a penny pamphlet Father C. Plater's stirring address on **Catholics and Social Action** delivered at the Mansion House, Dublin, last May, which we believe, has had some share in the growth of zeal for social reform in the Irish capital. It is an inspiring survey of what the Church has done and is doing in this important matter, largely by means of her faithful lay members.

The *Irish Messenger* of Dublin is also active in publishing cheap popular literature, excellently printed and got up. Two penny pamphlets connected with the Temperance Movement have recently reached us—**Alcohol and Health** (44 pp.) and **Six Temperance Stories** (32 pp.). The first-named is a classified collection of testimonies from various high medical authorities concerning the injurious effects on the human system of drinking alcohol. It is a record very striking in its scientific tone and its cumulative force, and, were the doctors themselves unanimous, it would settle the question once and for all. As it is, so long as the Temperance Reformer has not won over the bulk of the medical profession to his views, evidence such as is here presented, is deprived of much of its due force.

The C.T.S. of England send **The Child and His Mother**, bound (1s. 6d.), a collection of carols from the pen of Father David Bearne, S.J., which will make a delightful Christmas present to all lovers of poetry and piety. Also several penny pamphlets, **Blessed John Eudes (1601—1680)**, by Father Allan Ross, and **St. Monica (332-387)**; **The Catholic Faith in East Anglia**, three papers read at the Norwich Congress; **Practical Social Reform**, by the Rev. Thos. Wright and George Milligan; and **The Question of the Feeble-minded**, by Prior McNabb—the last two forming Nos. 19 and 20 of the C.S.G. series. All these Congress papers, dealing with important historical and social questions were well worth publishing in separate form. A useful addition to the Magic Lantern Series, **Wells Cathedral and Glastonbury Abbey**, by Mr. C. L. Jones, which provides descriptive letter-press for some fifty slides, has also appeared, price 4d.

Mr. D. L. Kelleher thinks that the modern muse is too prolific, that so many birds are singing, and singing so long, that no individual note can be heard and appreciated for the din. *He* will not merit that reproach, but selects from a century of his own poems one tiny dozen which he offers for 1d.—**Poems** (The *Courier* Office: Liverpool). So good an example merits encouragement in itself, and some at least of the dozen, notably one of the sonnets, "To a Boy who had upset a nest," are alone worth a much larger sum.

Some minor publications remain for notice. Another Congress paper, **Social Service for Catholic Women**, by Lady Edmund Talbot, is published by the Art and Book Company for a penny. It is a useful guide to the charitable activities open to leisured women who wish to take their share in Christianizing society. The same sum will purchase **The Minority Report of the Divorce Commission** (Longmans), of which mention is made elsewhere. The Animals' Friend Society send a number of twopenny pamphlets—**For Love of Beasts**, by John Golsworthy, **Dog-Stealing**, by C. R. Johns, **Horses in Warfare**, by Ernest Bell and H. Baillie-Weaver. This Society is doing a valuable work in trying to arouse public opinion against the vice of cruelty, indulged in or permitted for whatever plea, although we cannot always agree with its psychological principles.

Messrs. Washbourne's excellent **Catholic Diary for 1913** (1s. and 2s. net) makes a timely appearance. Containing 400 pages, it gives excellent value for its price, and abounds not only in the usual secular information, but in the record of events of interest and importance to Catholics. The same firm publishes at a penny a neatly got-up **C.B.B. and Scouts' Prayer-Book**, which was apparently compiled for the use of the Salford Regiment of the C.B.B. Its contents are largely taken from the well-known C. T. S. Penny Prayer-Book, but we have searched it in vain for any reference to the Scouts Organization, beyond that contained in the title. In view of the fact that the C.T.S. has recently brought out a very excellent Prayer-Book especially for Scouts, this misleading title is to be regretted.

We do not admire the title—**Mental Pills** (Relfe Bros., 9d. net)—of a little collection of moral maxims which reaches us, but most of them, if thoroughly assimilated, will doubtless contribute to spiritual health.

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice).

- APPLETON AND CO., New York and London.  
*Faith Brandon*. By Henrieta Dana Skinner. Pp. 424. Price, 1.30 net. 1912.
- BATSFORD, London.  
*A Short Critical History of Architecture*. By H. H. Statham. Pp. xv, 586. Price, 10s. 1912.
- BEAUCHESNE, Paris.  
*Cursus Philosophia Naturalis*. By J. de la Vaissière, S.J. Tom. I., II. Pp. ix, 343; ix, 399. Price, 3.00 fr. 1912. *Jesus Christ: Sa Vie et son Œuvre*. By M. Lepin. Pp. 269. Price, 2.50 fr. 1912. *Nestorius et la Controverse Nestorienne*. By Père M. Jugie. Pp. 326. Price, 6.00 fr. 1912. *Critériologia*. By René Jeannié, S.J. Pp. xvi, 616. Price, 5.00 fr. 1912. *Le Problème du Salut des Infidèles*. By L. Capéran. *Essai historique*. Pp. x, 550. Price, 8.00 fr. *Essai théologique*. Pp. vii, 112. Price, 2.50 fr. *Épîtres de Saint Paul*. II. *L'Épître aux Romains*. Pp. xvi, 305. Price, 4.00 fr. 1912. *L'Évangile du Paysan*. by Abbé P. Gérard. Pp. xiv, 366. Price, 3.50 fr. 1912. *De la préservation morale de l'Enfant*. By Abbé A. Chauvin. Pp. 100. Price, 1.25 fr. 1912. *Le Temple de Jérusalem*. By Abbé H. Lesêtre. Pp. viii, 216. Price, 2.50 fr. *Dictionnaire Apologétique*. Edited by A. d'Als. Fasc. VIII. *Gouvernement—Incarnation*. Price, 5.00 fr. 1912.
- BENZIGER BROS., New York.  
*The Little Cardinal*. By Olive Katherine Parr. Pp. 241. Price, 3s. 9d. net. 1912. *The Sugar Camp and After*. By H. S. Spalding, S.J. Pp. 233. Price, 50.85. 1912.
- BEYAERT, Bruges.  
*Betrothment and Marriage*. By Canon A. De Smet. Translated by Rev. W. Dobell. Vol. I. Pp. xxxv, 450. Price, (with Vol. II., cloth) 13s. 1912.
- BLAKE AND SON, Toronto.  
*The Wreck of the Titanic: a Poem*. By the Rev. A. O'Malley. Pp. 38. Price, 25 cents. 1912.
- BRETSCHNEIDER, Rome.  
*Bessarione: Indice Generale delle Prime Quindici Annate (1896—1912)*. By Di Amadeo Facchini. Pp. vii, 88. Price, 3.00 l. 1912.
- CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS.  
*The Problem of Evil in Plotinus*. By B. A. G. Fuller. Pp. xx, 336. Price, 7s. 6d. net. 1912. *Evolution and the Need of Atonement*. By Stewart A. McDowall, M.A. Pp. xvi, 155. Price, 3s. net. 1912. *The Cambridge History of English Literature*. Vol. IX. Pp. xiv, 609. Price, 9s. net.
- CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, London.  
*The Child and His Mother*. By David Beamie. Pp. viii, 71. Price, 1s. 1912. *Various Penny Pamphlets*.
- CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY OF IRELAND Dublin.  
*Nicholas Cardinal Wiseman*. By J. E. Canavan, S.J. Pp. 140. Price, 1s. net. 1912.
- CHATTO AND WINDUS, London.  
*Faustula*. By John Ayscough. Pp. 332. Price, 6s. 1912.
- CONSTABLE AND Co., London.  
*Rationalism*. By J. M. Robertson. Pp. 82. Price, 1s. net. 1912. *Congregationalism*. By B. A. Millard. Pp. x, 122. Price, 1s. net. 1912. *Unitarianism*. By W. G. Tarrant. Pp. xvi, 96. Price, 1s. net. 1912. *Pragmatism*. By D. L. Murray. Pp. x, 76. Price, 1s. net. 1912.
- THE DOLPHIN PRESS, Philadelphia.  
*Eucharistica*. By H. T. Henry, Litt. D. Pp. x, 252. Price, \$ 1.25. 1912.

## GABALDA, Paris.

*Pages Doctrinales : Dieu et la Religion.* By Abbé Léon Cristiani. Pp. 180. Price, 2.00fr. 1912. *Le Nouveau Testament dans L'Eglise Chrétienne.* By E. Jacquier. Tom. II. Pp. vi, 533. Price, 3.50 fr. 1912.

## GILL AND SON, Dublin.

*Summula Philosophiæ Scholasticæ.* Vol. I. *Logica et Entologica.* By J. S. Hickey, O.Cist. 3rd edit. Pp. xii, 451. Price, 4s. 6d. net. 1912.

## LETHIELLEUX, Paris.

*Lectures parallèles des Saints Evangiles.* By M. le Baron de Favières. Pp. 368. Price, 3.50 fr. 1912. *Prenez et Lisez.* By Mgr. de Mathies. Translated from the German by Abbé Ph. Mazoyer. Pp. viii, 302. Price, 3.00 fr. 1912. *L'aimable petite Sainte Agnes.* By Père J. Jubaru, S.J. Pp. 160. Price, 1.50 fr. 1912. *Bossuet Moraliste.* By Canon Pierre Bonet. Pp. xxiv, 410. Price, 5.00 fr. 1912. *Theologia Dogmatica Elementa.* By P. B. Previi, SS.CC. edit. 3a. Edited by P. M. J. Miquel, SS.CC. 2 vols. Pp. 712, 696. Price, 16.00 fr. 1912. *Les Tentations du Jeune Homme.* By M. E. Bruneteau. Pp. 370. Price, 3.50 fr. 1912. *Le Pain Quotidien du Père.* By J. P. Bock, S.J. Translated from the German by A. Villiers. Pp. xii, 500. Price, 4.00 fr. 1912. "Des Faux qui coulent doucement." By Joseph Rickaby, S.J. Translated by M. Jary. Pp. 300. Price, 2.00 fr. 1912.

## LONGMANS AND CO., London.

*The Continuity of the Church of England.* By F. W. Puller. Pp. xvi, 112. Price, 3s. net. 1912. *In St. Dominic's Country.* By C. M. Antony. Pp. xxiv, 316. Price, 6s. net. 1912. *History of the Roman Breviary.* By Mgr. Pierre Batiffol. Translated from the third French edition by A. M. V. Baylay, M.A. Pp. xv, 341. Price, 9s. net. 1912. *The Minority Report of the Divorce Commission.* Pp. 31. Price, 1d. *Miriam Lucas.* By P. A. Sheehan. Pp. 470. Price, 6s. 1912.

## MACLEHOSE AND SONS, Glasgow.

*Scotland and the French Revolution.* By H. W. Meikle, M.A., D. Litt. Pp. xix, 318. Price, 10s. net. 1912.

## MACMILLAN AND CO., London.

*On the Consciousness of the Universal and the Individual.* By Francis Aveling, Ph.D. Pp. x, 255. Price, 5s. net. 1912.

## MAUNSEL AND CO., Dublin.

*The Beginnings of Modern Ireland.* By Philip Wilson. Pp. xvi, 440. Price, 12s. 6d. net. 1912.

## METHUEN AND CO., London.

*Conscious Control.* By F. Matthias Alexander. Pp. xiv, 50. Price, 2s. 6d. net. 1912. *Pervigilia Veneris and other Poems.* By Sir A. Quiller Couch. Pp. viii, 138. Price, 3s. 6d. 1912.

## PICARD, Paris.

*Luther et le Luthéranisme.* By H. Denifle, O.P. Translated by J. Paquier. Vol. III. Pp. 502. Price, 3.50 fr. 1912.

## PLON-NOURRIT ET CIE., Paris.

*Figures Franciscaines.* By Lucien Rouré. Pp. x, 280. Price, 3.50 fr. 1913.

## OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS.

*Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History.* Edited by Paul Vinogradoff. Vol. III. By E. C. Lodge and A. W. Ashby. Pp. vi, 206; 190. Price, 12s. 6d. net. 1912. *The Ring and the Book.* By Robert Browning. Pp. xvi, 506. Price, 1s. 6d. net. and 2s. (Oxford Editions of Standard Authors.)

## PUSTET, Innsbruck.

*De Ecclesia Christi.* By Anthony Straub, S.J. In 2 vols. Pp. xcii, 500; vi, 916. Price, 25.50 m. 1912.

## SANDS AND CO., London.

*Through Refining Fires.* By Marie Haultmont. Pp. vii, 436. Price, 6s. 1912.

## SIMPLIFIED SPELLING SOCIETY, London.

*Simplified Spelling, an Appeal to Common Sense.* Pp. 95. Price, 6d.

## WASHBOURNE, London.

*Spiritual Progress. 1. Lukewarmness to Fervour.* From the French. Pp. xvi. Price, 2s. 6d. net. 1912. *Catholic Diary for 1913.* Pp. 400. Price, 1s. and 2s. 1912. *C.B.B. and Scout's Prayer Book.* Price, 1d. 1912. *The Apocalypse of St. John.* By J. J. L. Rattton. Pp. xiv, 417. Price, 12s. net. 1912. *Glimpses of Heaven.* By S. M. Aquinas, O.S.B. Pp. 158. Price, 1s. 3d. 1912. *The Orchard floor.* With Preface by Michael Field. Pp. xi, 165. Price, 2s. 6d. net. 1912. *The Consolations of Purgatory.* By Père H. Faure. Translated by W. H. Page, K.S.G. Pp. xi, 223. Price, 2s. 6d. net. 1912. *Christian Social Reform.* By George Metlake. Pp. iv, 246. Price, 5s. net. 1912. *The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas.* Translated by Dominican Fathers. Part I. Third No. Pp. vi, 561. Price, 6s. net. 1912.

## WELLS, GARDNER, DARTON AND CO., London.

*Marriage and the Sex-Problem.* By Dr. F. W. Foerster. Translated by Meyrick Booth, B.Sc. Pp. xviii, 228. Price, 5s. net. 1912. *The Truth of Christianity.* By Lt.-Col. W. H. Turton, D.S.O. 8th Edition, carefully revised. Pp. 636. Price, 2s. 6d. net. 1912.

## WILLIAMS AND NORGATE, London.

*Initiation into Philosophy.* By Emile Faguet. Translated by Sir Home Gordon, Bart. Pp. xii, 197. 2s. 6s. net. 1912.







# American • Ecclesiastical • Review

(A Monthly Periodical for the Clergy)

Theology  
Pastoralia  
Liturgy

Cum Approbatione Superiorum

Latest Roman Decret  
Relevia Criticisms of  
Books . . . . .



"THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW . . . in every respect deserves the highest praise. . . ."—*Civiltà Cattolica*, Rome, Italy.

"ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW contains excellent articles, cases of conscience, liturgical questions, etc. The Review will be found suitable to Ireland and England as well as to America."—*The Month*, London, England.

"This splendid REVIEW devoted to ecclesiastical studies."—*Revisita Internazionale*, Rome, Italy.

"THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, the most varied, perhaps, and most entertaining, and, at the same time, most solidly learned of the periodicals that appeal to priestly readers."—Father Matthew Russell, S.J., in the *Irish Monthly* (Dublin).

"THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW is one of the most useful periodicals that a priest can purchase; indeed, considering the information given in its pages, it should be found in all priests' libraries."—*Catholic Times*, Liverpool, England.

Two volumes (12 numbers), 15 shillings a year

## American Ecclesiastical Review

1305 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa. U.S.A.

NEW EDITION.

### MANUAL OF PRAYERS FOR YOUTH

EDITED BY

THE REV. JOHN MORRIS, S.J. (1893),

REVISED AND ENLARGED BY

THE REV. JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J. (1910).

*With the Approbation of His Grace the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster and His Lordship the Bishop of Southwark.*

Thirty-fifth Thousand.

LONDON:

THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY,  
69 SOUTHWARK BRIDGE ROAD, S.E.

Cloth, 276 pp., price 1s. net, post free.

# SCRIPTURE MANUALS

FOR

## CATHOLIC SCHOOLS.

Edited by the REV. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J.

---

**ST. MATTHEW.** By the Rev. JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J.  
Crown 8vo, boards, with three Maps, 2s. 6d.

**ST. MARK.** By the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. Crown 8vo,  
boards, with three Maps, 2s. 6d.

**ST. LUKE.** By the Rev. J. W. DARBY, O.S.B., and the  
Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. Crown 8vo, boards, with  
three Maps, 2s. 6d.

**ST. JOHN.** By the Rev. JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J. Crown 8vo,  
boards, with three Maps, 2s.

**ACTS. PART I.** (Chapters i.—xvi.) By the Very Rev.  
T. A. BURGE, O.S.B. Crown 8vo, boards, with Map, 2s.

**ACTS. PART II.** (Chapters xiii.—xxviii.) By the Very Rev.  
T. A. BURGE, O.S.B. Crown 8vo, boards, with Map,  
1s. 6d.

---

**BURNS & OATES, 28, ORCHARD STREET, LONDON, W.**

S

J.

ro,

he  
th

ro,

ev.  
s.

ev.  
p,